

JPRS 69282

20 June 1977

TRANSLATIONS ON EASTERN EUROPE
POLITICAL, SOCIOLOGICAL, AND MILITARY AFFAIRS
No. 1403

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

20000329 153

U. S. JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE

REPRODUCED BY
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

**Reproduced From
Best Available Copy**

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22151. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Indexes to this report (by keyword, author, personal names, title and series) are available through Bell & Howell, Old Mansfield Road, Wooster, Ohio, 44691.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

20 June 1977

TRANSLATIONS ON EASTERN EUROPE
POLITICAL, SOCIOLOGICAL, AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

No. 1403

CONTENTS

PAGE

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Western Leaders' Action on MBFR at London Meeting Attacked (Laszlo Bogos; MAGYAR HIRLAP, 20 May 77)	1
Western Leaders' Stand at London Meeting Examined (Tamas Zala; MAGYAR NEMZET, 22 May 77)	4
CSSR Hoffmann Addresses FDGB Congress in East Berlin (Karel Hoffmann; PRACE, 18 May 77)	7

EAST GERMANY

U.S.- Soviet Nuclear Nonproliferation Efforts Compared (Guenter Kuehne; HORIZONT, No 20,1977)	9
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

ROMANIA

Open Letter to Ceausescu on Human Rights (BULETIN DE INFORMATIE PENTRU ROMANI IN EXIL, 1 May 77).	17
Emigre Organ Reports Persecution of Neoprotestants (BULETIN DE INFORMATIE PENTRU ROMANI IN EXIL, 1 May 77).	19

YUGOSLAVIA

Military Journal Examines 'Proletarian Internationalism' (Blazo Nikolovski; VOJNO DELO, Mar-Apr 77)	23
LCY Secretary Dolanc Answers Questions on Belgrade TV Program (TANJUG Domestic Service, 3 Jun 77)	40
Recent Instances of Alleged Serb Chauvinism Scrutinized (Aleksandar Vuco, et al.; NEDELJNE INFORMATIVNE NOVINE, 8 May 77)	51

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

WESTERN LEADERS' ACTION ON MBFR AT LONDON MEETING ATTACKED

Budapest MAGYAR HIRLAP in Hungarian 20 May 77 p 2

[Article by Laszlo Bogos: "Central European Reduction of Armies--A Point of View With Foundations"]

[Text] The leaders of the NATO member countries engaged in a deceptive exhibition in London during the first half of May concerning the mutual reduction of military forces and arms in central Europe. The representatives of the Warsaw Pact countries and NATO countries have been talking in Vienna about this subject for the fourth year running. This spectacular play took place right in the spring recess of the Vienna military reduction talks, when preparations should have been made in earnest for the 12th session of the talks.

Opinions urging preparations worth of merit were even voiced by the disarmament experts of some NATO countries--for example, Alfons Pawelczyk of West Germany. Social Democrat Alfons Pawelczyk, president of the disarmament subcommittee of the Bundestag military committee, said in an interview given to DIE WELT at the end of April, before the conclusion of the 11th Session of the Vienna talks: "The Vienna talks have arrived at a point where preparation of the first agreement has become possible. This agreement prevents the traditional arms race and enables the first steps toward a decrease in the number of troops." According to the West German politician, NATO should have prepared for the first concrete agreement to become possible. It appeared from one of the statements made in early May by Cyrus Vance, the U.S. secretary of state, that preparations would in fact be made. To wit, the secretary of state, agreeing that progress at the Vienna troops and arms limitation talks would be very important, said: "Joint decision is necessary in NATO on the issue which will be on the agenda at the London summit and at the NATO conferences."

In the interest of the first concrete agreement, an accord should finally be reached on what should be decreased, and when. In this regard, the socialist countries already proposed in their first suggestion that the 11 countries which directly participate should decrease their armed forces and armaments by more than 15 percent over a 3-year period. The planned cutback includes

foreign and national forces stationed in the area, land-based troops, and air force and nuclear forces. The socialist countries' later supplementary proposals were characterized by far-reaching flexibility, taking into consideration the other side's position.

Until now the NATO countries' behavior made the practical elaboration of an agreement impossible. These countries are willing only to decrease personnel; specifically, only land-based personnel. Even this reduction they propose to do in an unequal manner. They demand that the socialist countries decrease their armed forces about three times as much as the NATO countries. The goal of their efforts is to upset, on the one hand, the ratio of armed forces which developed in the area, and, on the other, to receive a free hand to further develop the Bundeswehr. The socialist countries, rejecting the unacceptable Western proposals, have already stated during the 11th session of the Vienna talks that there are three conditions for the concrete agreement:

1. The parties should agree on the principle of equal percentages for reductions.
2. Not only military personnel but also armaments and arms technology are to be decreased.
3. Along with land-based troops, the air force and the military branches equipped with nuclear forces are to be decreased.

On the basic issue of mutual reduction of military forces in central Europe--what should be decreased, and when--the leaders of the NATO countries repeated their earlier, untenable position in London, creating the illusion that it is their sincere intention to decrease the armed forces. Thus Jimmy Carter, President of the United States, emphasized in his speech that the United States continues to support the effort to reduce armed forces in central Europe, but immediately added that he feels the proportional decrease suggested by the socialist countries would help them obtain "unilateral military advantages."

The leaders of the NATO countries concentrated their attention in London not on the decrease of military power in central Europe but on the better coordination of the increase of their military forces. President Carter, while supporting the propagandistic statement that the NATO countries must face the threat of the armed forces of the Warsaw Pact, said the United States and its Western European allies must jointly strengthen their armed forces. This point of view was also included in the communique issued at the conference. The wording of the communique is a deceptive act, since according to the evaluation of the London TIMES the communique's basic statement is that NATO is ready to cooperate with the Warsaw Pact, but in reality it is more determined than ever, and until new agreements are reached, it will strengthen its military potential.

This statement, worded in thieves' language, contains the raw truth that the leaders of NATO countries endeavor not to reduce their armed forces, but to further escalate the process of arming. They themselves are the ones who put obstacles in the way of reaching agreements, so that in the meanwhile they can strengthen their military might.

The arming effort of NATO countries is built on a fear psychosis based on false impressions, since, as even the West German Alfons Pawelczyk said in his statement to DIE WELT: "The present power relationship between NATO and the Warsaw Pact is firm; there is no military threat from the Warsaw Pact."

The socialist countries firmly demand that NATO countries decrease their military forces stationed in central Europe without undermining their security.

8584

CSO: 2500

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

WESTERN LEADERS' STAND AT LONDON MEETING EXAMINED

Budapest MAGYAR NEMZET in Hungarian 22 May 77 p 8

[Article by Tamas Zala, MAGYAR NEMZET's Washington reporter: "To Attach or To Cut Loose"]

[Text] Washington, 21 May--The London summit conference was billed in advance, as is generally done with the appearance of superstars. Now the critics add that we were eyewitnesses--and earwitnesses--not only to a simply sparkling gala evening but also to a "heart- and soul-warming benefit performance." Western leaders--Carter among them--sent the message to "the poor people of the world" that "you are our brothers, and we love you. If you are not unworthy of it, you may even expect our assistance."] The plan drafted in London actually bears the hallmark of that "spiritual workshop" which came into existence a few years ago on Brezinski's initiative, using the money of the Rockefellers and of other Croesusses. Its goal is to strengthen ties between those societies based on the principle of profit accumulation, which are progressing in the frontlines of technological growth, and to lead humanity toward a new international order suitable to their goals.

Ruthlessness and Charity

Let's not be stymied by the fact that the "rich ones," who are not exactly known as softhearted, preach the merciful teaching that "all men are brothers." No matter how much this contradicts reason, it is true that in the history of large American fortunes, even if not since the beginning, at least since the end of the 19th century, the entrepreneur's ruthlessness and merciful charity have been coexisting in "brotherly agreement." The only difference today is that what has been practiced for decades within the American framework, without any results, is today being contemplated as a universal method. Detailed ideas suitable for today's conditions were discussed in the trilateral committee, and the master, Brezinski, personally volunteered to lay down the theoretical foundations for "charitable guardianship." His book on the subject has been written, but not yet published.

The basic concept which can be gleaned from the available information is that our world--more exactly, the world economy--is not only uniform, but also homogeneous. This should be interpreted to mean that the only decisive factor is the difference in the level of economic life. The way of progress for all nations can be only the same as the one on which the West is proceeding, and those who wish to reach a high degree of industrialization should follow the lead of the Western nations.

Sachs' Theory

As far as the interdependence of the world's economy is concerned, there is hardly any doubt, but now the theory of homogeneity is being doubted not only by socialists, but also by developing countries. There is a famous economist in France, who is a professor at the Sorbonne and appears from time to time at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology as a guest lecturer. A little book which is relatively thin was recently authored by him, but it has already drawn much attention from theoretical researchers dealing with the Third World, and even from politicians. Ignacy Sachs, the author, says no less in this book than that everyone has misunderstood the developing countries, and the biggest problem, according to him, is that the developing nations have misunderstood themselves. The author is searching for an answer to the question of whether the Third World has a development strategy, and if so, whether it is a good one. His answer is that there is one, but it is not a good one because in actuality it consists in nothing other than the practice of aping the industrially leading societies. They are using "models" borrowed from others in organizing themselves and their own economies. They are following the examples of societies whose historic development has been entirely different. Thus there is nothing surprising in the fact that negative aspects of the economic structures which are considered examples, and copied, also result. Sachs refers to inflation, the "strange life style," and to the overcrowded and uncontrollably "overpopulated" cities. But what they are expecting most does not occur: the rapid economic growth and the social prosperity that follows it.

Sachs has the same problem as Princeton's famous professor of economics: the economic lagging of the so-called Third World. Only while he approaches his topic from the perspective of intellectual "conserving forces," William Lewis focuses on the historical circumstances and attributes a determining role to the structural characteristics which can be deduced from them.

The Cobweb

The roads of progress began to diverge only at the end of the 18th century. This is when the industrial revolution took place in England, but it was confined to a relatively narrow geographic area, and did not spread to those parts of the globe where today's Third World countries are located. The peoples of these countries were only connected to the process

of what is today considered civilization at the end of the 19th century, but this association was not voluntary, and it was not in the least based on the concept of equality. Those millions who lived in Europe and outside North America were swept into the whirlwind, and their fate became the same as that of insects fallen into a cobweb: their life forces were sucked out. Whatever they must have, they will "buy" for peanuts; more accurately, what is needed is taken away, and then sold to them very expensively. A continual negative balance results for these peoples, this is the main reason for their poverty and lack of progress. World trade organized in this manner is nothing but the tool of "permanent" blood-sucking, and the "magnanimous" aid only serve as a local anesthetic. Lewis also adds that this will remain the "order of things" as long as the developing countries consider themselves economic appendages of the "developed world" and adjust their internal systems and entire economies to the developed countries with the excuse of development strategy.

Parallel Programs

What, then, is the way out of this deadly cobweb? In any case, it can't be that the developing nations are tightening the ropes of their attachment; rather, they should try to cut themselves loose as much as possible. Sachs suggests parallel programs for developing nations. A fairer distribution of income, agrarian reform, "cultural revolution," strict control of foreign trade, and a well-planned population policy are needed in Third World countries. He also places emphasis on the need for the developing countries to grow their own food, so that they are not forced to import either grain or fodder. They should not look to the agriculture of the American Midwest as an example. This is how Sachs summarizes his thoughts: "The only rational method of development is that each nation should tailor its plans for itself, and should conduct an economic policy best suited to its own needs."

8584

CSO: 2500

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

CSSR HOFFMANN ADDRESSES FDGB CONGRESS IN EAST BERLIN

Prague PRACE in Czech 18 May 77 pp 1, 2 AU

[Report on speech by Karel Hoffmann, chairman of the CSSR's Central Trade Union Council (URO), at the East Berlin FDGB Congress on 17 May]

[Text] We sincerely rejoice that you have succeeded, in such a historically short time, in transforming the ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin into reality, and that as heirs to the founders of scientific communism you have built a socialist social system, K. Hoffmann said in the opening part of his speech.

We congratulate you on your excellent results, which have fundamentally changed the life of the working man and have made the GDR a prospering country, with high standards of industrial and agricultural production, which belongs among the world's most advanced countries as regards the working people's standard of living and as regards the social and cultural spheres. Together with you, the URO chairman continued, we are proud of the FDGB's share in the successes achieved, as was highly praised by the Ninth SED Congress and the SED Central Committee message of greetings to your congress. Your determination to continue your path, your efforts to utilize the FDGB's increasing strength, new opportunities, resources and all reserves to implement the Ninth SED Congress conclusions for a still better life for the working people and for the consolidation of socialism in the GDR, as it stands in the FDGB Presidium report, is very convincing.

K. Hoffmann further said that a congress of the Czechoslovak URO will be held shortly after the Ninth FDGB Congress. We, too, he said, will appear before the delegates with a successful balance sheet of 5 years of work for the working people, for socialism. Our organization will again identify itself with the 15th CPCZ Congress' program and will specifically determine how the trade unions will contribute to its fulfillment. At the URO initiative the Czechoslovak working people have been preparing themselves for the Ninth All-Trade Union Congress, and have been approaching the 60th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the

30th anniversary of the victorious February with new successes in construction and fulfilled socialist pledges. This effort of the people, concentrated on the implementation of the Sixth Five-Year Plan tasks, leads to the further consolidation and expansion of social security and the increased prosperity of the working people, to the strengthening of the combat unity of the international workers and all-trade union movement, to the consolidation of peace throughout the world.

K. Hoffmann further noted that, for the revolutionary trade union movement, the Ninth All-Trade Union Congress will at the same time be the start of preparations for the Ninth World Trade Union Congress, which will be held in Prague next year, and for whose successful course the revolutionary trade union movement wants to create the best possible conditions.

We are profoundly satisfied with the high standard and good results of cooperation between the FDGB and the revolutionary trade union movement, with our united course in international questions and with the joint determination to continue developing our relations and cooperation, the head of the Czechoslovak trade union delegation emphasized. Our relations are in harmony with our citizens' vital interests and the policy of the CSSR and GDR Marxist-Leninist parties, and express full support for the endeavors of our highest representatives, Comrades G. Husak and E. Honecker, in this respect.

We are glad, K. Hoffmann stated, that our congresses also provide trade unionists with an opportunity to give a cogent answer to our enemies' contemporary attacks against socialism, against the unity of the working people, and that they convincingly prove that the socialist system gives the working people incomparably greater freedoms and democratic rights than capitalism, that the socialist trade unions are playing an ever increasing role in society and that no attacks can divert the working people of our countries from the path on which they have embarked, on which they have achieved such important successes. Our congresses prove that we are on the correct path, side by side with our common, reliable and battle-tested friend--the Soviet Union, its heroic people and the experienced Soviet trade union organization. At the same time they prove the strength of the working people's international solidarity and unity, the URO chairman added.

In concluding his speech, K. Hoffmann wished the delegates success in their congress and all GDR working people many successes in the implementation of the FDGB Congress solutions.

CSO: 2400

U.S.-SOVIET NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION EFFORTS COMPARED

East Berlin HORIZONT in German Vol 10, No 20 signed to press 9 May 77 pp 8-9

[Article by Guenter Kuehne in "Reflections on Our Times" feature section:
"A World Without Nuclear Arms--Possibility or Dream?"]

[Text] The danger of a world war with atomic missiles has still not been totally eliminated. International accords and treaties, particularly the Treaty on Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the USSR-United States agreement on the prevention of nuclear war, as well as the process of detente initiated at the beginning of the 70s, have reduced the chance of a nuclear war. The time seems to be ripe for the permanent solution of this burning problem for the future of mankind.

Nuclear weapons are the most dangerous weapons of mass destruction presently in existence. Today's nuclear weapons cannot be compared with those dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki by the United States. The American scientist G. Kennan labeled the Hiroshima atom bomb a "child's toy" compared with the nuclear weapons which are now in their launching silos. Current nuclear weapon supplies are actually sufficient to destroy all life on earth several times over. For every inhabitant of the earth there is the equivalent of 15 tons of conventional explosive. The possible consequences of the introduction of nuclear weapons in a military conflict are incalculable. A report drawn up by well-known scientists for the 22nd UN General Assembly says: "If such weapons are ever introduced on a large scale, hundreds of millions of people could be killed, and civilization as we know it, as well as organized social life, would cease to exist in the countries involved in the conflict."¹ The report dates from 1967. Developments in this area have not stood still since then. These weapons of mass destruction have been further perfected in quality, especially as regards their delivery systems and their exactness of targeting. This process has still not been stopped.

Strategic Armament Program of the United States

The current NATO military doctrine of "Flexible response" includes nuclear weapons as "deterrents" and their possible employment. The arms race

pursued by the imperialist powers thus also includes the nuclear arms field. Of the enormous U.S. arms expenditures (according to the budget proposals of the Carter administration for the financial year 1977/78 they will reach the new record figure of 111.9 billion dollars) a significant proportion will thus cover nuclear armament. According to the U.S. newspaper THE WALL STREET JOURNAL of 9 March 1977 the expenditures for the U.S. MX missile program alone (this new missile type is to replace the Minuteman missile) come to 30 billion dollars and the construction of the new long-range bomber designated as B1 comes to 22.9 billion dollars. The overall costs for the new strategic submarine missile system Trident, now under construction, have been estimated at 16.3 billion dollars, of which 7.1 billion has already been spent.

These three items in the U.S. armaments program alone give us an idea of the enormous financial means which are being spent on expanding armaments, including nuclear ones. If the nuclear arms race could be successfully stopped, these resources could be put to positive use in solving many social problems in the world.

U.S. President J. Carter, in his inaugural address, aroused hopes. One sentence in the address reads: "This year we will take a step on the road to our goal--the elimination of nuclear weapons throughout the world!" Truly a promising utterance. But no deeds have so far followed these words. On the contrary, both the U.S. proposals to the SALT negotiations, aimed at unilateral military advantages, which had to be rejected by the USSR, and also the undiminished continuation of nuclear armament in the United States by no means point to a genuine readiness to take a step forward on the proclaimed road. As early as 1946 the Soviet Union proposed radical solutions for the problem. In a "Proposal for an International Convention on the Prohibition of the Production and Use of Nuclear Weapons for Mass Destruction," presented to the United Nations, the proposal was made not only to forbid the utilization of these weapons but also to destroy all nuclear weapons stocks within 3 months. Since then, the Soviet Union has placed dozens of proposals on the negotiating table and has made public appeals to approach the goal step by step.

Opponents of Nuclear Disarmament and Their "Arguments"

Today, as then, there are bitter opponents of the worldwide banning and eventual destruction of nuclear weapons. One of these is a certain Wolfram von Raven, a member of the CDU-CSU fraction of the Bonn Bundestag and an "expert" on military and security affairs. He needed no more than 6 days for his own answer to Carter's declaration of desire to eliminate nuclear weapons from the entire world. The "idea of total denuclearization" was by no means a suitable motive for a change, he said, since "we must...live with the bomb, which in the forms of the mushroom cloud of Hiroshima was planted once and for all in the soil of our planet."² Such a claim is monstrous! To agree with it would mean that we must live in fear and

terror, without the prospect of a secure, lasting peace. The yearning of the peoples for peace, their fight for the banning of weapons of mass destruction, would then be a mere illusion, a dream.

The intention to eliminate these weapons of mass destruction, von Raven argues, "would fail just as did the attempt of the Lateran Council of 1139 to ban the crossbow, as it were, through moral force."³ Now, an atomic bomb is not a crossbow and 1977 is not 1139. Attempts to draw a historic parallel are vain. Admittedly, the crossbow also served for the waging of war, but, as a hunting weapon, it was also an instrument of life-support for human beings, something which can hardly be claimed for atomic weapons. On the contrary, their possible application would destroy mankind's existence and constitutes a threat to our planet. The totally different nature of the atomic weapon compared with the crossbow makes it necessary to place a ban on it. Von Raven adduces another "argument" why the nuclear weapon "has so far proven a blessing." Peace "does not basically stem from our reason, but chiefly results from fear of war."⁴ This is basically an elegant rewriting of the "philosophy of deterrence," which tries to make us believe that only a high, steadily rising potential in weapons of mass destruction guarantees peace. Such a "theory," generally coupled with the lie of the "peril from the East," is supposed to justify, today as before, the enormous expenditures of Western countries and NATO on weapons, to their own populations too.

History provides sufficient examples to prove that international security cannot be reached through more weapons. The attempt to prevent war with a policy of atomic deterrence necessarily leads to the further material preparation of such a war. The essence of such preparation is that it is possible to destroy mankind not just once but countless times. Such a policy is clearly intended to let its proponents use military strength as a means of political pressure against the socialist countries, to obtain, over the long term, military superiority once again, and ensure high profits for the arms monopolies.

A Constructive, Realistic Program

Since it came into existence, the Soviet Union has not only paid lip service to a world without arms but has put forward numerous concrete, realistic proposals and negotiation offers to attain this noble goal. The core of the program for peace and disarmament of the socialist states is the elimination of the danger of a nuclear war. The safest way and most radical solution would undoubtedly be the annihilation of all nuclear weapons existing on earth. But this clearly fails when faced with the powerful influence still exerted on the policy of imperialist states by the nuclear arms lobby, the military-industrial complex and such "intellectual" opponents of disarmament as von Raven.

In the United States, too, resistance against genuine measures of military detente on the part of the so-called hawks is still great. They still

cling to a "policy of military strength." Successes are therefore not going to drop into mankind's lap. The fight of the masses, public pressure on the governments of capitalist countries, joint actions of supporters of peace and proponents of disarmament are thus all the more important. They increasingly derive from the proposals of the Soviet Union and the other states of the Warsaw Pact which were put forward in the "Memorandum of the Soviet Union on the Cessation of the Arms Race and for Disarmament" presented to the 31st UN General Assembly and in the Bucharest Declaration of the member states of the Warsaw Pact in November 1976. They attest to the great power and worldwide influence of socialism and prove once again that socialism, peace and disarmament are inseparable. These documents of programmatic importance are directed at the following measures to attain the desired goal--the liquidation of all nuclear weapons--step by step:

1. Cessation of the Nuclear Arms Race

The limitation of strategic armaments is the current principal requirement for the cessation of the spiral of nuclear armament. Negotiations on this are going on between the USSR and the United States. The first accord in this connection--known as SALT I--was signed in 1972 and has a validity of 5 years. It established limits which are not to be exceeded. The modernization and further technical development of the weapons systems within the limit agreed upon was still permitted. The issue now, expressed most simply, is to limit the number of strategic delivery systems not only quantitatively, but also to control their qualitative improvement. It is precisely in the improvement of the weapons of mass destruction that there is great danger at present. Such a treaty agreement--SALT II--is also to be of long duration, i.e. to have validity up to at least 1985. The framework for this new agreement was established as early as December 1974 between then U.S. president G. Ford and General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee L. I. Brezhnev. It was agreed that each side may possess 2,400 strategic delivery weapons, of which 1,320 may be multiple-warhead missiles. These guidelines had already been largely formulated in a treaty text at the Geneva Negotiations. But the Ford administration was not prepared to sanction them with a treaty. Tactical maneuvering related to the presidential elections may have played a certain role in this regard. But the decisive factor was a concession to the pressure of the opponents of a new SALT accord. So, the decision was left up to the new U.S. administration. This administration placed on the table this March proposals which were totally unacceptable to the Soviet Union and which had simply to be rejected.

As is well known, two variants were proposed by the United States. On the one hand, a supposedly comprehensive program for nuclear disarmament was proposed. It foresaw a significant reduction of the limit agreed upon in Vladivostok. On the other hand, readiness was expressed to sign a treaty establishing the limits agreed upon in 1974. Both offers seemed

at first sight to be realistic and to express U.S. readiness to be interested in a limitation, if not actually a reduction, of strategic arms. If, yes if, there were not a cloven foot maliciously stamping on the principle--one agreed upon by the United States too--of equal security for all participants. At an international press conference in Moscow on 31 March 1977, Andrei Gromyko called negotiation offers which violated this principle and were quite clearly directed at the obtaining of a unilateral advantage, a cheap trick designed to put the Soviet Union in a less favorable position. The key role in this poker game was held by a totally new system of arms technology developed in the United States, which has already been tested and is now under production. This new weapon, known as the "cruise missile" or "winged missile" was, at the "wish" of the Carter administration to be excluded from the treaty, although it is clearly a strategic weapon system and must consequently fall under the limit agreed upon. Not for nothing is it highly praised by the Pentagon and presented as indispensable to U.S. national security. This weapon possesses properties which make it particularly dangerous. According to figures in the West German news magazine DER SPIEGEL of 4 April 1977, the "cruise missile" is a "miracle weapon flying at beneath the speed of sound" which "puts all previous weapons systems in the shade." This unmanned vehicle has a range of 3,700 km, which can be extended by a reserve fuel tank to reach strategic distances. Its flight height is less than 40 meters, which means that it can fly under radar and air defense systems. The built-in radar, computer and navigation system makes it possible to avoid obstacles and ensures high accuracy of aim. And, the decisive point, it can be equipped either with a conventional or with an atomic warhead. Moreover, it can be launched from submarines, surface vessels and planes. To permit the United States to possess such a weapon outside the limit, i.e. uncontrolled, would mean that, as the STUTTGARTER ZEITUNG of 4 April 1977 rightly says, "the entire existing balance of forces would be placed in question." But the very purpose of the SALT negotiations is to maintain this balance at a lower level, i.e. to reduce the potential of terror. As "compensation" for the Cruise Missile the Soviet Union is to be permitted to place in service a new Soviet bomber type with the NATO designation "Backfire." The technical specifications of this aircraft, however, quite clearly show it to be a tactical weapon, so that it simply does not fall within the field of the agreement. It simply served the United States as a trumped-up argument to get the right to produce the Cruise Missile in unlimited quantities and place it in service.

The Soviet Union will naturally not permit any imperialist state to achieve such military superiority over socialism that it believes itself capable and in a position to win a war. The military invincibility of the Soviet Union and its allies has in large measure contributed to impressing upon all those who might wish to attempt to solve the basic contradiction between socialism and capitalism by means of an armed conflict, the hopelessness and suicidal nature of such an intention. It is worthwhile to point out to those who fight for and support the arms race that "the economy, science and technology in our country (the reference is to the

Soviet Union) are at such a high level that within the shortest of periods we are in a position to build any kind of weapon in which the enemies of peace set their hopes."⁵ This makes it clear that intentions to achieve military superiority over the USSR are in vain. There is also no contradiction between this and the fact that the Soviet Union and the states of the socialist community, in their relations with the United States, are jointly, consistently and permanently supporting the limitation of strategic arms based upon the principle of equality and equal security, which would open the way to nuclear disarmament and the liquidation of all nuclear weapons. "The military potential of the Soviet Union," General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee L. I. Brezhnev recently said, "must be great enough that none may dare to disturb out peaceful life. Our policy is not aimed at superiority in armaments, but at their reduction, at the dismantling of military confrontation."⁶

2. Prohibition of All Nuclear Tests

The general and complete prohibition of all nuclear tests would influence the termination of the arms race very significantly. Without nuclear tests it is not easily possible to develop new types of nuclear weapons or to develop the existing ones qualitatively. As early as 1975 the Soviet Union presented a proposal for a treaty on the general and complete prohibition of nuclear tests in all media and by all states. The solution of this problem is under negotiation by the UN disarmament commission in Geneva.⁷

3. Strengthening the Rule on Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons

The 1968 treaty on the nonproliferation of atomic weapons has had the effect that the number of states in possession of atomic weapons has not risen, although not all nuclear powers are treaty signatories. Meanwhile there has been an increase in the number of states in a position to produce their own nuclear arms by acquiring atomic power stations with appropriate plant. These include states which have refused to adhere to the treaty. The urgent necessity to universalize the treaty is growing, since an increase in the number of states possessing nuclear weapons would necessarily increase the danger of a nuclear war. The Soviet Union has declared its readiness to work together with all interested states to create further safeguards and guarantees against the further spread of nuclear arms.

4. Refusal To Use Nuclear Weapons

The prohibition by international treaty of the utilization of nuclear weapons is a further focus of the policy of the socialist states aimed at peace and security. Such a prohibition would eliminate the danger of a nuclear war and at the same time lead to the nonproliferation of these weapons of mass destruction. The idea of prohibiting nuclear arms worldwide is not a new one. As early as 1950 well-known scientists demanded

the banning of the atom bomb in their "Stockholm Appeal." The Soviet Union presented a proposal to the 27th UN General Assembly to sign a treaty covering the nonapplication of force in international relations and a prohibition on the use of nuclear weapons for all time. The draft of a treaty to this effect was presented by the Soviet Union to the most recent UN General Assembly, and met with the agreement of the overwhelming majority of UN members and found a world-wide response.

This draft, as well as the Warsaw Treaty states' proposal of November 1976, that the states participating in the all-European conference bind themselves by treaty not to make first use of nuclear weapons against each other on land, by water, in the air and in space, was rejected by militarist circles in the Pentagon and NATO with threadbare arguments. Hidden behind them was the intent of NATO not to exclude the use of nuclear weapons in the event of an armed conflict. But the proposals have not been withdrawn. They are a firm part of the overall peace program of the states of the socialist community.

5. Prohibition of the Creation of New Types and Systems of Weapons of Mass Destruction

Under this heading we are mainly concerned with the prohibition of the creation of new systems of application of nuclear weapons, which would give them yet more lethal properties. In the Soviet Union's memorandum on the cessation of the arms race and on disarmament, the example is cited of the creation of air/space systems of nuclear weapons based upon space transport vehicles. This also covers the development of the new strategic weapons system in the United States known as Trident. This is a new nuclear submarine equipped with two different types of ballistic missiles. The Trident program is the subject of strong controversy even in the United States itself. The Soviet Union has on several occasions proposed its elimination, since such programs "are additional causes of distrust, necessitate countermeasures and impede negotiations and agreements."⁸ In its draft agreement presented in 1975, the Soviet Union based itself on the prevention from the very start of the development and production of new types and systems of weapons of mass destruction, since experience shows "that production and an armaments step-up, once underway, are frequently hard to stop, even when the previous arguments for their development should prove to be baseless."⁹

6. Creation of Nuclear Weapons-Free Zones

The socialist states are the initiators of the creation of zones free of atomic weapons. As early as the 1950s the People's Republic of Poland, supported by other socialist states, presented a proposal to create such a zone in Central Europe. The NATO states rejected it. Presently there are proposals to declare Africa, the Indian Ocean, the Near East, Northern Europe and the Balkans such zones. If regions or entire continents are

successfully kept free of nuclear weapons, the states existing on their territory would be kept out of the nuclear arms race and the utilization of nuclear weapons in cases of armed conflict would be prevented. The socialist states therefore support every initiative to form zones free of nuclear weapons in various parts of the world.

We can conclude that the Soviet Union and the socialist states allied with it in the Warsaw Treaty possess a concrete, detailed and at the same time realistic program for the creation of a world free of the terror of a nuclear catastrophe. That country thus proves, in the 60th year of its existence, that peace and security for mankind emanate from socialism. This peace policy which serves the interests of all peoples and the needs of the working masses, arises from the nature of socialism itself.

FOOTNOTES

1. Effects of the Possible Use of Nuclear Weapons and the Security and Economic Implications for States of the Acquisition and Further Development of These Weapons, New York, 1968, p 1.
2. Wolfram von Raven, "Ein amerikanischer Traum," [An American Dream] DIE WELT, 31 January 1977, p 6.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.
5. D. Ustinov, "Protector of Peaceful Labor, Bastion of World Peace," KOMMUNIST, No 3, 1977.
6. L. I. Brezhnev, "Fight for Peace Is in Accordance With the Vital Interests of All Peoples," NEUES DEUTSCHLAND, 19 January 1977.
7. Cf. in this connection HORIZONT, No 15, 1977, pp 5-6.
8. A. G. Arbatov, "Trident--Discussion of a Strategic Program," USA--ECONOMY, POLITICS, IDEOLOGY, Moscow, No 3, 1977.
9. Ibid.

8849

CSO: 2300

ROMANIA

OPEN LETTER TO CEAUSESCU ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Paris BULETIN DE INFORMATIE PENTRU ROMANI IN EXIL in Romanian
1 May 77 p 5

/Open letter to Nicolae Ceaurescu by the Romanian Committee for
Free Travel of Persons in Europe/

/Text/ An open letter was sent to Ceaurescu by the Romanian
Committee for Free Travel of Persons in Europe and was signed
by a large number of Romanians besides the committee's president,
Mr C. Stoicanescu. Here are the main points in this letter:

"The Romanian Committee for Free Travel of Persons in Europe
is addressing you since you are the chief executive of the pres-
ent regime in our country. We feel it is our duty to solemnly
draw your attention to certain serious facts which you certain-
ly must know--that wherever communist governments have put them-
selves in power, man's basic rights are not being respected. In
Romania your government violates all international and internal
laws which bear your signature. Whenever the freedom of expres-
sion does not depreciate into groveling flattery of the regime
it is likened to slander and treason. Romanians cannot enjoy
traveling or settling abroad except in special cases. Here are
some specific cases, among others: Roxana Marcoci and Serbân
Stefanescu--their passports were withdrawn one day before their
departure and they were sent to forced labor, Paul Goma--re-
ceived by Burtica and thrown into prison. In short, after the
impression is made of a certain flexibility faced with dissent
from within the country, your government brutally is returning
to Stalinist methods. Right in the heart of Paris, on the es-
planade of Chaillot Palace, each day citizens from all countries
see the most deplorable spectacle which only the communist sys-
tem can still present. During a glacial coldspell which threat-
ens to exhaust them physically, two Romanian painters, Sergiu
Manoliu and his mother Maria Manoliu, continue a hunger strike
which they began to obtain the liberation of all Romanians sent

to the forced labor camps or to prison for the single crime that they requested respect for the international laws signed by your government. Alongside them, two young Frenchmen, Silviu Hodos and Jean Pierre Mariacca, also have begun a hunger strike because their fiancées have been hindered from leaving Romania to come and get married. Is it really permissible that in the age of interplanetary travels, our compatriots--your citizens--cannot cross the border in order to go to visit a sick mother, or to see one's child, husband or wife or fiancée again?

Because your government is ignoring this proof, the number of those taking the responsibility before history to warn you is growing each day in Romania. The repressive methods of your government arouse pity for these decisive people who are prepared to sacrifice their lives. Instead of changing our--and your--beautiful country into a penitentiary, would it not be more appropriate to ask yourself why the Romanians, who never were a nation of emigrants, now are on the way to becoming one? Would it not be better to eliminate the causes of this evil instead of trying to combat the symptoms through repressive measures which go against the goal followed? In the interest of the Romanian people we ask that you immediately take measures to be enforced because international laws which guarantee people the right to express themselves and to have the right to free travel should be applied in Romania. We ask that you immediately stop the police tactics against the defenders of human rights in Romania, who express the will of a nation to defend liberty, its customs and values as well as its dignity at any price."

8071

CSO: 2700

ROMANIA

EMIGRE ORGAN REPORTS PERSECUTION OF NEOPROTESTANTS

Paris BULETIN DE INFORMATIE PENTRU ROMANI IN EXIL in Romanian
1 May 77 pp 7-8

/Unattributed article/

/Text/ In the last issue we published information in which we showed that the Baptists in Romania sent an open letter to their faithful throughout the world signed by Pastor Iosif Ton of Ploiesti, Pastor Pavel Nicolescu of Bucharest, Dr Silviu Cioata which is part of the Evangelical Christian cult in Ploiesti, Eng Aurelian Popescu, an evangelist in the Baptist cult, Radu Dumitrescu, a teacher dismissed from his job, Constantin Caraman, a preacher for the Pentecostal cult. This letter also bears 35 other signatures of various believers. The document starts by showing that Romania has signed the following international treaties: the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Convention on the struggle against discrimination in the area of education, the international pact on political and civil rights as well as the final act of Helsinki. The regime in Bucharest does not respect one of these treaties.

The document of the Baptists in Romania is an overwhelmingly accusatory act. It shows the followers of the Neoprotestant, Evangelical, Baptist and Pentecostal cults are being followed and condemned on the basis of Law No 153/1970 which was made "to combat acts of hooliganism and those who lead a parasitical and anarchic life." Since this law was promulgated, it has been applied Baptist, Protestant, Pentecostal and Evangelical believers who have been betrayed before the courts and sentenced, either with fines or with prison. The document gives an entire list of more than 100 names of believers persecuted and sentenced, as is the case of Emilian Rosianu from Curtea de Arges (26 May 1974) who was fined 5,000 lei because he was at a religious meeting in the village of Oiesti. In the village of Radacinesti (Vrancea) in January 1977 a group of Baptist believers were arrested by the militia in their homes, taken to the peoples council and there were threatened and abused.

On 27 June a Pentecostal meeting took place at the home of the Dumitru Rosca family of Str. Soveja 26 in Bucharest. They were fined 62,000 lei.

Dozens of names are listed, which reveal the persecutions to which religious followers in Romania are subject. There is Pastor Vasile Branzei of Bucharest, Dr Daniel Aninoiu of Campina, Stefan Dobrescu of Vulcana Bai, Constantin Magdici of Vintul de Jos (Alba) who is active in the Army of God. Ion Sanu, Matei Lusca, Zoltan Vintila, Dumitru Chercea and Laurian Chercea on 3 November 1973 were penalized 19,000 lei, Lidia Barbu of Timisoara, Baptist Pastor Liviu Olah and so forth.

The Religious Followers are Demoted or Kicked Out of Their Jobs

The signal of the campaign of persecution of followers of the Neoprotestant cult was given on a 22 March 1975 television program when Adventist Professors Ion Nicolae Gabriel of the general school in the village of Blejesti and Titu Ghejan of the general school in the village of Siretel were brought before television viewers on the program entitled "The Lecturer's Chair is not the Pulpit." They were ridiculed and insulted. After several days they were kicked out of education. However, the campaign took on even greater proportions after August 1975, after the Helsinki conference, and the document gives several telling facts: In August 1975 chemical technician Filip Dinca of the Teleajan refinery in Ploiesti was called to the director of the refinery, who announced that he had received an order that since he was a Baptist he would be demoted to a worker, which did happen after several weeks. Bucur Cornel of the 1 May enterprise in Ploiesti was changed from the job he had since he, too, was a Baptist. A Pentecostal, Eng Ion Catana of Arad, with a family of eight children, was demoted and sent to the ice factory as a worker. Another Pentecostal, Eng Aurel Mihaies of Timisoara was forbidden from taking his graduation examination for one year. Prof Leontin Goma of Timisoara was forced to resign. A Pentecostal, Prof Ioan Bares was removed from his job. A Pentecostal, Eng Cristian Roski, former head of services in the Documentation Institute in the Ministry of Agriculture, was kicked out of his job and since then has been without work. Prof Ioan Negrila of Zalau, a Baptist, was dismissed in January 1977 and was ridiculed on the "Reflector" program on television. Teodor Balica, director at the Romanian Railroad School in Arad, was dismissed from his job since he was a Baptist. Eng Varlan Titu--dismissed from the county water management office in Arad. Prof Iosif Cinca--dismissed in Arad and sent to a factory as a worker. P. Milovan from the village of Salavale was dismissed from his job. Eng Constantin Margaras, former director of the Cluj Energy Secondary School--dismissed and transferred from his

office to be a worker in a factory. Husband and wife Radu and Maria Dumitrescu of Bucharest, professors, first were demoted and then dismissed. Lt Traian Dezan was removed from the army and now works as a worker in the railroad car factory in Arad. Instructor Mariana Basa of Bucharest had her contract revoked by disposition No 14 of 11 January 1977 of the Bucharest School Inspectorate since she was part of a religious sect and was making propaganda for religious faith to the pupils; Marioara Popa of Bucharest, a graduate of the pharmacy school in 1975, was assigned to a pharmacy in Iasi. As part of her assignment she was asked to take an oath. She explained that her religious faith did not permit this. She was a Baptist. She was not hired and, what is more, was also declared "failure to appear at the job" and was fined 8,000 lei. She has submitted a complaint to the Ministry of Labor but with no result.

Discrimination in Schools

For two years at certain faculties such as history, law, philosophy and so forth at the admittance examination the candidate has been required to present a recommendation from the Union of Communist Youth [UTC] and only on this basis is his request for admittance accepted. Since the systematic exclusion of the children of Neoprotestants from the UTC takes place in the secondary schools, they no longer can receive recommendations for these faculties. The Baptist document gives several cases of abuses of Neoprotestant pupils in schools in Romania.

On 5 April 1975 in the general school in Avrig (Salaj), the pupils were formed into a square and the Baptist children were taken in front, insulted by the school's director while the village policeman warned them that if they went to church again they would be sent to a correctional school.

These pupils were exmatriculated from the Arad Pedagogical Secondary School: Cornelia Lacatus, Lucia Stanca, Catita Ancatan, Corina Cantean and Mircea Mandrutiu because they were Baptist. The school's director told them: "I consider you traitors, not Romanians."

These pupils were exmatriculated from the Slavici Secondary School in Arad: Maria Tamas, Delia Mecsca, Maria Oda, Ana Santes, Leanu Radu. Elena Bogsag, a pupil, was injured by a professor because she was a Baptist. In the general school in Sebes (Arad) in 1977, the children of religious followers were forced to stay on their knees in the hall of the school to be laughed at by their colleagues.

Other dozens of cases of violations of human rights in Romania are shown in this accusatory document.

It concludes by stating that its signers have used various occasions offered them in the last two years to signal these illegal acts to RSR state authorities at various levels--some very high. They were answered that these acts will be noted so that the situation can be remedied. However, things have not changed and that is why they felt forced to signal the forums before whom Romania has obligated itself to respect basic human rights and liberties, thus finding vindication for the suffering of their brothers in faith.

This document, as can be determined, is the most terrible accusatory act ever to come out of Romania regarding the violation of human rights by the regime in Bucharest. It is an act which exceeds by far all the attempts made by some dissidents in Romania. It is a precise document, with proof and facts which place the assassin regime in Bucharest at the stake of infamy. The Baptists in Romania deserve the recognition of the Romanian people for the first and only authentic act of courage made in the last 30 years in communist Romania.

8071

CSO: 2700

MILITARY JOURNAL EXAMINES 'PROLETARIAN INTERNATIONALISM'

Belgrade VOJNO DELO in Serbo-Croatian No 2, Mar-Apr 77 pp 53-70

[Article by Col Blazo Nikolovski, Ph.D.: "Proletarian Internationalism and Its Dimensions in Current Events"]

[Text] Proletarian internationalism, which is one form of linkage among the world's democratic, progressive and socialist forces, presupposes a movement's commitment to fight consistently for socialism, for the power of the working class and for achievement of its dominant position in society. At the same time it presupposes unreserved aid and support to all other progressive movements and forces on a basis of equality and noninterference in the affairs of others.

Internationalism has always been an expression of the social demands of the progressive forces; its content has depended on the conditions objectively given at the particular stage of development of the proletarian movement. If we trace the development of the proletarian and democratic movement, we find that the internationalism of the class of producers has been developing along with the development of that movement itself, exerting an influence on it and at the same time broadening its own dimensions in current events and in the creative realm.

Internationalism as an Expression of the Real Conditions and Interests of the Revolutionary and Democratic Movement's Development

In its global definition of the internationalist cooperation of the socialist forces the League of Communists puts first emphasis on respect for sovereignty and independence, nonintervention in the internal life of other peoples and movements, and the responsibility of a revolutionary party to its own class and its own people; it bases this position on the views of Marx, Engels and Lenin and also on the real historical and current conditions and interests of socialist and other progressive forces. We are talking about principles of internationalist cooperation which are shaped by reality; this kind of cooperation is possible only and exclusively among socialist forces which are truly sovereign, independent, self-sufficient and equal. In the absence of these vital attributes, there can be no

effective cooperation, nor authentic unity of action among the progressive and democratic forces.

The content and yardstick of internationalism have been changing--developing and becoming richer and more up to date--as a function of the kind of demands confronted by the international worker movement and by the revolutionary democratic forces which are both vehicles and reflections of progressive processes.

In the era when the working class came into being and commenced its development--first as a class "distinct from other classes," then as a "class motivated by its own interests"--when Marxism, as the working class' most progressive ideology and view of the world, was taking command over broad proletarian forces, internationalism tried its strength and affirmed itself in the struggle to rally the proletarian forces, to unify them and to bring them over to the positions of scientific socialism. This essential meaning is expressed by the slogan with which the Manifesto of the Communist Party concludes: "Workingmen of All Countries, Unite!" This was the orientation of the activity later carried on both in the framework of the First International and also the Second International while F. Engels was still alive. Lenin therefore attributed great importance to the founding of the First International and to its activity; he said that it "laid the foundations of an international organization of the workers so as to prepare them for the revolutionary assault on capital ... and it thereby also laid the foundations of the international proletarian struggle for socialism."¹

In the framework of the Paris Commune, the first government of the proletariat in history, internationalism was directly manifested in the correct position taken toward the German workers and toward workers in the world in general and in the recognition of their rights to be elected and to perform all functions in the official bodies of the Commune.² Their election to the highest official bodies of the Commune was accompanied by a decree that stated that "The flag of the Commune is the flag of the world republic." German, Italian, English and other class-conscious European workers at the same time supported and popularized the Paris Commune, thus giving proof of their own internationalist solidarity with the proletariat of Paris.

As Marx put it, the Commune was organized as "an extremely flexible form of rule by the working class," one which made it possible for internationalist cooperation to develop; since that cooperation had such a short time, it was unable to ensure broader international linkage and support. Marx emphasizes that the Commune was "the true representative of all the wholesome elements of French society and therefore an authentic national government, as a bold early fighter for the emancipation of labor, was markedly international. Before the eyes of the Prussian army, which had annexed two French provinces to Germany, the Commune annexed to France the workers of the entire world."³

The content of internationalism, then, has always reflected the real (historical and current) interests of the proletarian forces and has tended

toward maximum expression of the most progressive aspirations of the class of producers.

Lenin's views concerning internationalism confirm that he understood this term to represent the struggle of every movement for the national and social liberation of a subjugated nationality and--in accordance with the real conditions, the aiding of that kind of struggle being carried on by other peoples and movements. In the polemics he waged against his opponents, the opportunists of the Second International, Lenin offered a "brilliant definition" (Vlahovic) of internationalism when he wrote that "there is one and only one internationalism indeed: self-sacrificing work to develop the revolutionary movement and revolutionary struggle in one's own country; aiding (with propaganda, sympathy and material assistance) that same struggle, that same line, and only that line and struggle--in all countries without exception."⁴

Lenin pointed to the complementarity of the struggle to develop the revolutionary movement and revolutionary struggle in one's own country and supporting that same kind of struggle in other countries and movements. It requires no great effort to see that the struggle for socialism in one's own country, the struggle for the power of the working class, is the basic condition for offering support along that same line to other forces fighting for those goals. In this sense Lenin's definition of internationalism not only has not been superseded, but is in fact becoming more and more relevant every day. This is in fact the explanation for the incorporation and elaboration of the basic elements of that definition in the LCY Program, which dates from 1958.

On the basis of a consistent respect for the principle of internationalist cooperation in its original--Marxist-Leninist--meaning, applied to the specific conditions and needs of the country's postwar socialist development, the League of Communists of Yugoslavia was able in its Program to elaborate and creatively redefine Lenin's definition of proletarian internationalism and of proletarian solidarity. The LCY Program defined internationalist cooperation as "first, the determination of the labor movement to develop in its countries a consistent struggle for socialism and the daily interests of the working people; to use all forms of work and struggle to increase its influence...; and second, the principle of proletarian internationalism includes support of the same struggle in all other countries, that is, solidarity with the labor movement and socialist forces of the world in their struggle for the fulfillment of their daily economic and political demands, for peace and for socialism."⁵

The application of internationalism in a concrete situation, that is, development of the specific forms of internationalist cooperation, is, however, a matter of the historical moment, a matter of the specific conditions and needs of the movement and of the diverse revolutionary forces which are developing that cooperation.

It is understandable, for example, that in V. I. Lenin's time, between 1917 and 1924, proletarian internationalism was measured by the world proletarian movement's attitude toward the destiny of the young Soviet republic. At the time when it was surrounded by the armed interventionists of 16 imperialist countries and the internal White counterrevolution, this "measurement" of internationalism was historically justified. But as soon as this danger disappeared in the post-Lenin era, when the USSR was recognized, when its positions were consolidated, and when the coexistence of countries with different social systems was affirmed, the justifiability for appealing to internationalism as a policy embodying the protection and absolute support of the positions and stands taken by the first socialist country also disappeared as a matter of history. The slogan of devotion to the first socialist country as the principal yardstick of loyalty to proletarian internationalism inevitably became anachronistic and dysfunctional and indeed harmful to the authentic development of international cooperation among the revolutionary forces. This slogan became even more a brake upon development of authentic internationalist solidarity in the movement and among socialist forces following World War II, when the world was enriched by the appearance of some 10 more new socialist countries in which communist parties had organized the government and the construction of socialism.

Dogmatization of the Criterion of Proletarian Internationalism

In the post-Lenin period, however, the forces which had established themselves at the helm of the Soviet state and party dogmatized the conception of internationalism measured by the attitude toward the first socialist country, which in a different historical context, in the period when that country was establishing itself as a state and as a member of the international community, had an unavoidable foundation.

The narrow and one-sided conception of internationalism as the proletarian movement's obligation to unconditionally and uncritically support and follow the experience and positions of the first country which carried out a proletarian revolution had an adverse effect in several directions.

First of all, through the Third Communist International (founded in March 1919) relations were developed in the post-Lenin period which altogether contradicted Lenin's conception of the internationalism of revolutionary forces. The position of the executive body of the international was strengthened, a link was uncritically forged between this body and the top leadership of the Soviet party, plenary meetings of the International were held at considerably longer intervals, and the member-parties of this international communist organization became sections (affiliates) of the center in the true sense of the word. Through the creation of this center, with the emphasis on monolithism and centralized decisionmaking, and with the construction of the so-called general line and suspension of the opportunity of the "sections" to apply those decisions in accordance with their own concrete conditions and needs--damage was indisputably done to proletarian internationalism and to the unity, equality and independence of the individual parties and movements.

The deformations of internationalism were also felt in the domestic development of the Soviet state in Stalin's time, once again in quite a broad domain of its activity: in the relations among the nationalities, in the strengthening of the state as a regulator, in the excessive emphasis given to the state and party elements at the expense of affirmation of the class of producers, in the mass purges on the eve of World War II, and so on. In that period internationalism actually became government policy of the post-Lenin Soviet state and a function of its domestic and foreign policy.

This unquestionably had an impact on the conception of internationalism by the Stalinist leadership on a world scale as well.

The Spanish revolutionary Jesus Hernandez betrayed bitterness when he said "had the democratic countries, the Soviet Union first of all, helped us to purchase the arms which the Spanish people wanted to buy and pay for, the Franco revolt would have been crushed in a few weeks; the Spanish people would have won its victory before Hitler and Mussolini had time to bring their personnel and war materiel into the fight against it."⁶ The case of Spain in 1936-1939 was not an isolated one. Selfish interests and calculations which manifestly contradicted internationalism led Stalin's ruling team to initiate the dissolution of the communist parties of Poland and Yugoslavia in 1938 and 1939, to hang fire in offering aid to certain European countries which were being attacked by Hitler's hordes, and then again and in addition to superficially and erroneously evaluate the danger of fascism and to sign a pact with Hitler calling for friendship and nonaggression.

What made it possible for attitudes like this to be taken toward other countries and movements in Stalin's time was the obvious attempt to dogmatize proletarian internationalism as a one-sided commitment, a commitment consisting exclusively of loyalty and devotion to the first socialist country.

Pressure on Yugoslavia Under the "Cover" of Internationalism

As Lenin said, internationalism presupposes development of the revolutionary movement and of revolutionary struggle in one's own country, along with aiding that same struggle in all other countries. This is stated clearly and unambiguously. It is also crystal clear that that statement contains not a trace of elements which might serve as any pretext for intervention in the internal affairs of other movements and countries.

Stalinist policy and practice, however, negate the Leninist essence of internationalism and incorporate the component of intervention and imposition of judgments into the elements of its content. This provides at least a partial explanation of Stalin's intervention in and imposition of judgment on certain aspects of the armed part of our revolution, whether it was a question of holding back in the sending of aid in the form of materiel, the sending of representatives for the military mission, or whether it had to do with imposing certain forms of development on the revolution which did not suit our own specific conditions and revolutionary needs. The reserve

shown toward the formation of proletarian units, local governments in liberated territory and the Antifascist Council of the National Liberation of Yugoslavia and toward the evolution of the National Liberation War to become a unified national and social revolution against the occupiers and domestic traitors is the best confirmation of this.

The infamous Resolution of the Information Bureau of Certain Communist and Worker Parties (1948) appealed among other things to proletarian internationalism, which signified a flagrant distortion and violation of that principle itself. The attempt to divorce our government and party leadership from the people, from the working class and from the League of Communists was also made in the name of "protecting internationalism" and of affirming the "wholesome forces" in the Yugoslav worker movement, whose "internationalist duty" it supposedly was to put pressure on their own leaders and to honor the allegations and demands of the Resolution of the Information Bureau. An economic blockade was organized under the slogan of internationalism, treaties were unilaterally violated, economic damage and difficulties were inflicted, there were political insults and border provocations aimed at a people and party who had consistently defended their own sovereignty, independence, their right to survival as a socialist country and their freedom to develop on their own, and equal relations among socialist forces in the world.

The campaign of political propaganda and economic and military pressure on Yugoslavia, which was deliberately organized and directed from a single center and which lasted all of 7 years, was actually a deformation of proletarian internationalism.

By maintaining the consistency of its own authentic revolution, by resolutely resisting the unscrupulous pressures, and by defending the principles of Marxism-Leninism concerning relations among socialist countries, the Yugoslav worker movement, taken in all its complexity, demonstrated its historical allegiance to true proletarian internationalism.

The resistance which the Communist Party of Yugoslavia offered to the conception and practice of building socialism and relations among socialist countries and communist parties as inaugurated by Stalinism and the activity of the Cominform has far-reaching importance to world history and to internationalism. "In this conflict and in its resolution our views were worked out concerning relations in the international worker movement and relations among socialist countries. Tito formulated these positions as follows: the right of every party to independence and the responsibility of every party to its own working class and its own people, the right of every party and socialist country to seek its own strategies in developing socialism, the right of socialist countries to independence, nonintervention in internal affairs, cooperation on the basis of equality and respect for sovereignty."⁷

In the struggle of our nationalities and ethnic minorities and of our worker movement to effectively resist the diverse pressures of the Cominform and in

the resolute endeavor to affirm the principles of equality, sovereignty and nonintervention in the internal affairs of other countries and movements--one must emphasize the visionary acumen and historical contribution of Comrade Tito. Assessing the intentions of the Cominform campaign, which were to break up the unity, independence and socialist orientation of Yugoslavia, Comrade Tito said: "Could we have been silent in the face of all that? I say straight out that we could not afford to keep silent. Neither I nor any of us would have been revolutionaries if we had let ourselves go with the tide and bowed our heads just in order to make life easier for ourselves, since a horrible tragedy would in that case have occurred in subsequent revolutionary developments."⁸

Internationalism as an "Alibi" for a Particular Concept of Monolithism

There were many paths down which internationalism was led astray in the post-war years and not only during the open Cominform campaign against Yugoslavia.

The thesis of the indispensable existence of a single center has been elaborated almost continuously even though the Cominform had dramatically manifested its harmfulness and the untenability of its views in the context of the advanced international movement and in a world where independent parties had established strong positions for themselves. The conferences of communist parties held in the period between 1957 and 1969 unambiguously demonstrated that the thesis of "the necessity of a center" was living a tough existence in the theory and practice of those who organized the conferences.⁹ One was led to this conclusion because participants in the conferences insisted on the need for further development of compulsory forms of enforcing the decisions of the center, its "general line" and monolithism. All of this was advocated with an appeal to proletarian internationalism, which was a compulsory platform for rallying the group of parties around a particular center, which frequently was defined in vague terms.

Proletarian internationalism was reduced to the function of building up and defending "monolithic" unity and to a resounding slogan, which was supposed to serve to "close the ranks" of the other parties around the communist party of the largest country of the Camp and to strengthen the so-called community of socialist countries. However, it was not merely a question of conceiving internationalism as a slogan and as a synonym for strengthening monolithism, for closing ranks, and for unreserved implementation of the so-called general line, but internationalism was also conceived and understood as a shield, as a cover for intervention in the internal affairs of certain socialist countries and parties, and in such cases an appeal was made to discharging an "international debt" toward other socialist forces. Proletarian internationalism was actually given functions and meaning which it never had and never could have had in the time of Marx, Engels and Lenin.

The theses to the effect that proletarian internationalism is an expression of loyalty to the first socialist country have become stronger from time to time, and there has been a definite continuity. Moreover, internationalism has been given attributes which could not belong to it by the logic of its

nature and as a form of cooperation among socialist forces. To be specific, it has been called a substitute (replacement) for peaceful coexistence, as a "lower" form of cooperation among socialist countries!¹⁰ In Soviet legal and even political literature it is not so uncommon to read that proletarian internationalism is the platform of socialist international law, which, incidentally, has not been given institutional form, because the relevant international elements do not exist which would separate it from general international laws, whose principles have been recognized even by the socialist countries. It is asserted that peaceful coexistence is the platform of general international law, while internationalism is the platform of socialist international law, which, beyond all doubt, is an arbitrary expansion of the dimensions of proletarian internationalism into spheres which do not exist and which in any case do not belong to it.

On the other hand proletarian internationalism has been crudely set in opposition to the sovereignty of the socialist country, to the autonomy of individual movements and parties, to the responsibility of those parties to their own working class and their own people, and its application has actually been narrowed so that it applies only to the communist parties and socialist countries covered by the policy and position of the Warsaw military-political organization.

The events in Czechoslovakia in 1968 also demonstrated that internationalism can be interpreted and used as a slogan and as an ideological pretext for action which is in fact incompatible with authentic internationalism. To justify an invasion by the armed forces of a group of socialist countries into another socialist country by calling it the "internationalist obligation" of those armed forces, even though the working class and party of the country which is the victim of the intervention were differently disposed, demonstrated beyond doubt the extent to which internationalism has been denuded and subordinated to the momentary military-political interests of the organizers of the military intervention. To make a link between internationalism and military intervention, especially when in practical terms no consideration is given to the ability and sovereign right of the domestic socialist forces (the working class, the people and the party) to make their own decisions concerning the character of their own domestic development and concerning the measures to be taken to protect the socialist achievements, represents an utter degradation and compromise of the principle of internationalism. Military intervention is incompatible with proletarian internationalism, and emphatically so when it monopolizes the right of the domestic revolutionary forces of a particular country, when it takes the position that the sovereignty of a country or people is a part of some collective sovereignty, and so on. An internationalism which does not respect the right of a socialist (independent, progressive) country to sovereignty, independence, nonintervention in its internal affairs, which does not include the principle of a revolutionary party's responsibility to its own class and its own people, is not and cannot be in line with its own original Marxist and Leninist meaning, nor with the patterns of the present time and the interests and needs of the development of the international worker movement and development of other progressive forces in the world.

Proletarian internationalism cannot and must not be an "alibi" for ignoring the sovereign rights of other countries and movements, for usurping the responsibility of national revolutionary parties and movements for the socialist and progressive development of their own countries, and for military interventions, regardless of the motives for which they are undertaken.

Sovereignty and Independence as Essential Components of Internationalism

The 1968 events concerning Czechoslovakia gave occasion for taking a clear stand against conceptions to the effect that the sovereignty of a socialist country is a relative national value and a relative right of a country's internal forces and people. A public stand was taken in that period to the effect that proletarian internationalism is incompatible with the national sovereignty of a socialist country. Many theoreticians and authors of articles and publications, people like Kovalev, Kessev, Varkon and others, felt at the time that the sovereignty of a socialist country was of secondary importance, and that prime importance belongs to proletarian internationalism, that is, the "integrated" sovereignty of socialist countries. These theses have led step by step toward subordinating the sovereignty of a socialist country to the so-called general interests of socialism, i.e., the internationalist obligations of the socialist countries, which, in the opinion of certain authors of that time, ought to stand over and above the national sovereignty of any individual socialist country.

This look back to the past would not be worthy of particular attention if the old theses concerning the primacy of the international over the national had not been revived in our time again. Recently the Soviet author V. V. Aleksandrov, in a book entitled "The Struggle of the CPSU for the Unity and Monolithism of the International Communist Movement," which was published by Znaniye, wrote that proletarian internationalism is the "highest international debt of a party." That is, of course, a matter of the party in question. But what is not a matter of that party alone is that proletarian internationalism cannot be given a content and essence which do not belong to it. Thus as author Aleksandrov interprets it, the basic content of proletarian internationalism is the struggle for the monolithic unity of communist parties, the struggle to strengthen firm discipline in the movement, which he says is an integral part of the norms of proletarian internationalism, and so on. The author tries to make internationalism cover obligations of individual parties to carry out "decisions and recommendations which have been jointly worked out" and to act on the basis of resolutions which have been adopted "jointly." The kind of internationalism that is advocated, then, is one which does not go beyond efforts to strengthen monolithic unity, to rally the parties around a general line and platform, which means that the internationalism of the individual parties is measured in terms of their attitude toward these contents, which are actually fictitious.

As we see it, it is indispensable to recall the positions taken by the League of Communists of Yugoslavia concerning the relationship between the national and the international, that is, concerning the true content of proletarian internationalism, which, as we have seen, was established and developed in

the classics of Marxism-Leninism. Back at its Ninth Congress in 1969 the LCY set forth its position that "to set the interests of socialism in the world against authentic national interests is an artificial dilemma which we reject.... On the other hand, we see attempts to set the class interests and international interests in opposition to national interests, which is based on the position that the class interests and the international interests are something given in advance and definite and there is not to be any discussion as to what they are...."¹¹

It was emphasized on that occasion that socialism's strength lies in the fact that it respects the different and contradictory interests that arise out of diverse conditions and the abundance of national strategies and forms of socialist practice in various countries and that it reconciles those interests on the basis of democratic give and take. This is the foundation for building a socialist internationalism which presupposes mutual support and aid to revolutionary and progressive forces in the world. "Any intervention in the internal affairs of other countries and parties and any imposition of solutions or 'models' from outside can only slow down the socialist transformation of the world and stands therefore in contradiction to the goals of socialist internationalism."¹²

Proletarian internationalism is not actually an abstract concept; it is a movement's concrete attitude toward itself and toward progressive aspirations of other movements, toward its own progressive development and toward results in the struggle for the power of the working class and for its interests. This presupposes aid and support to other revolutionary movements and forces as well, but this must be on a voluntary basis and must not involve intervention in their internal affairs. The view was stated that there can be no internationalism if its basic features--respect for sovereignty and independence and the principle of nonintervention--are artificially displaced from its content. It was a necessity, then, to emphasize at the 10th LCY Congress that "there is a growing conviction that independence and nonintervention represent the basic precondition for developing relations on the basis of equality and solidarity among socialist countries, communist and worker parties, and other progressive forces and movements."¹³

Internationalism Presupposes a Party's Responsibility to Its Own Class

The thesis of the dual responsibility of a party (to its own working class and to its people, but at the same time to other socialist countries as well) has maintained itself for quite a number of years and has from time to time taken on a vigorous existence in certain parts of the communist movement. As we have already mentioned, the thesis of "dual" responsibility became particularly evident in the period of the well-known "Czechoslovak events" in 1968.¹⁴

The real dangers of attempts to narrow the sovereignty and autonomy of individual countries and parties have made it a necessity that the position of the LCY concerning cooperation on an equal basis be constantly updated. The Resolution of the 10th LCY Congress, for example, contains the position

that "in developing relations and cooperation with other parties and movements the League of Communists of Yugoslavia takes as its points of departure the principles of independence, equality, mutual respect for interests, nonintervention, and the responsibility of revolutionary parties and movements to their own working class and people. It is on these foundations that the LCY will continue in the future to base its international solidarity and to develop manifold and mutually beneficial cooperation with communist, socialist and other progressive parties and liberation movements."¹⁵

The principles of internationalist cooperation, among which a party's responsibility to its own working class and to its own people occupies an important place, have been constantly stressed and confirmed both in the documents of the LCY and also in the practice of developing relations with socialist forces in the world.

In the period of preparation of the Conference of Certain Communist and Worker Parties of the European Countries, which was held in mid-1976, the problem of the essence and content of proletarian internationalism under present-day conditions became relevant once again. One of the issues which needs to be particularly clarified and defined is the question of a revolutionary party's responsibility for the results of its own struggle for socialism, for its contribution to peace and progress, that is, for realization of the leading position of the working class in the dimension of current events and the historical dimension.

Some parties, the LCY among them, were able to take part in the Berlin Conference of European Communist and Worker Parties, for one thing because they were aware that many views they had been advocating had become acceptable to a broader group of communist parties in Europe. In spite of the existence of a broad spectrum of opinions and views on many problems concerning cooperation among socialist forces, the Berlin gathering of European communists could not bypass the two basic constituent elements of international cooperation--respect for the sovereignty and responsibility of each party to its own working class and its own people. Without these constituent elements and without this authentic dimension internationalism, as Lenin said, would remain "a dead letter at best." The final document adopted by the Conference of Communist and Worker Parties of European Countries could not, of course, fail to take a position on these issues. One passage of this document reads as follows:

"They (the participants in the Conference--V. N.) will develop their internationalist comradely voluntary cooperation and solidarity on the basis of the great ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin, while strictly respecting equality and the sovereign independence of each party, nonintervention in internal affairs, and respect for freedom of choice of different strategies in the struggle for progressive social transformations and for socialism. Each party's struggle for socialism in its own country and its responsibility before its own working class and people are related to the mutual solidarity of the working people of all countries, all progressive movements and peoples in the struggle for freedom and strengthened independence, for democracy, socialism and peace throughout the world."¹⁶

The struggle of the LCY and many other communist parties and progressive movements to affirm the principle of a party's responsibility to its own working class and its own people is recording increasingly important and concrete results and is making an evident contribution to overcoming the conception of the so-called dual responsibility of the worker (communist) vanguard.

The Broader Foundation of Internationalist Cooperation

Another issue which has also been a "matter of dispute" in the communist movement for a long time is the problem of the "spatial" dimension of internationalism.

If one analyzes the sources in the literature and cases in practice one can confidently assert that internationalism as understood by Marx, Engels and Lenin lay on a broad foundation in that this mode of linkage was applied to a large number of revolutionary and progressive forces. Within the framework of the First International, for instance, Marx tried to link together all socialist and revolutionary groups and currents and to gradually bring them to the positions of scientific socialism. Lenin took particular satisfaction (in March 1920) in welcoming the alliance between the Moslems and non-Moslems in India, saying that this was true internationalist cooperation. "Only when the Indian, Korean, Japanese, Persian and Turkish worker and peasant shake hands and apply themselves in concert to the common task of liberation will the decisive victory over the exploiters be assured."¹⁷

The issue of the breadth of the "spatial" dimension of proletarian internationalism is, however, a particularly relevant question today. There are several reasons for this. First, the content of proletarian internationalism is subject to change, to development, to enrichment, and to updating insofar as relevant qualitative and quantitative changes occur in the development of the socialist forces in socialism's growth to become a world process, and in the contemporary requirements of the revolutionary forces in the world. Second, the progressive forces have grown enormously on all continents; frequently they do not fit either within the forces making up the "communist" wing, nor the forces making up the "Social Democratic" wing. Large and numerous anticolonial national liberation movements have come into being and grown in which the leading ideological and political role is played principally by national liberation fronts and certain similar national democratic parties and unions. The revolutionary and progressive movement has become massive, broad and heterogeneous. Internationalism has at the same time become a broad basis for linking together all progressive forces within that massive revolutionary and national liberation movement, and not merely for linking the forces of the "communist" or "Social Democratic" wing, or the socialist countries included within the boundaries of a military-political alliance. Internationalism is incompatible with the camp-oriented logic in developing relations among socialist countries.

Comrade Tito has several times warned of the danger of narrowing, impoverishing and pragmatizing internationalist cooperation.

"Internationalism cannot be divided into larger and smaller domains, into the internationalism of the camp and internationalism outside the camp, since it is universal in the sense of studying the science of Marxism-Leninism and of applying it in practice. Internationalism, then, is a praxis, and not a matter of words and propaganda.... We are charged with not being internationalists, because we are not in the camp. Those comrades think that internationalism is dependent upon belonging to the camp, and not belonging to the socialist world in the broader sense."¹⁸

Although 18 years have passed since adoption of the LCY Program, the positions which it inaugurated in connection with internationalist cooperation are as relevant as they ever were. Their meaning is unquestionably oriented toward the conception of internationalism as a broad basis for cooperation among socialist forces on the basis of equality and voluntary participation. This is exclusively stated: "proletarian internationalism demands correct relations and solidarity with and support of every socialist country and every socialist movement which truly fights for socialism, for peace and for peaceful, active coexistence among nations."¹⁹

Actually, socialist internationalism cannot be restricted just to the socialist states and communist parties under the present conditions of the rich diversity of forms and content in the development of the worker movement. This makes it an historical imperative to broaden and update the dimensions of internationalism so as to cover all parts of the international worker movement. This is historically inevitable and logical, for one thing because "proletarian internationalism is not a principle governing relations among communist parties, but a principle governing relations in the working class as a whole. After all, the working class in the world does not consist exclusively of communists. Some members of the working class are socialists, Social Democrats, or radicals, and some are even Christian Democrats."²⁰

It is not merely a question of grasping the broader foundation of proletarian internationalism on the basis of short-term considerations of developments in the socialist, communist and national liberation (anticolonial) movement, but of understanding that these reflections and conclusions are based on a continuity of the views expressed in the classics of Marxism and by Marxists in general to the effect that internationalism is a broad (unbounded) platform for equal cooperation among socialist and progressive forces. The well-known Marxist Palmiro Togliatti particularly emphasized the idea of internationalism as a broad foundation for cooperation of proletarian forces in his Yalta memorandum (1964), saying that it was a question of an internationalism which under present-day conditions would be aware of the multitude and diversity of the links that exist between different revolutionary experiences and which would at the same time be capable of emphasizing the original, practical and theoretical contribution of diverse revolutionary processes. Luigi Longo, stated these ideas of Togliatti more precisely in August 1968 when he spoke in a plenum of the Communist Party of Italy as its president.²¹

There are two basic reasons, among others, which made it possible for these conceptions of internationalism to come about. First, the communist parties are obviously not the only parties and movements which are fighting for socialism, and in the colonial and newly liberated countries they are not even the most important ones; second, internationalism, as one of the forms of linkage among revolutionary and progressive forces, cannot be reduced today to the proletarian internationalism that formerly existed and extended only to relations among some 10 or so socialist countries engaged in active cooperation with one another.

In a discussion of the continuity of the idea and practice of internationalist cooperation on a broad basis, we must take note that the LCY, in developing its continuous struggle against a sectarian attitude toward other (noncommunist) parties, noted early on the importance and inevitability of a broader application of internationalism both with respect to the forces involved and also with respect to the domains in which the particular revolutionary and progressive forces are operating. The League of Communists of Yugoslavia formulated these positions as follows in its Program: "Yugoslav communists will accept and encourage various forms of equal cooperation not only with the communists of other countries, but also with other progressive parties and movements--with each of them individually or with all of them together, provided always that they feel that this cooperation can contribute to the strengthening of peace, to a closing of the ranks between peoples and progressive movements, and to the progress of socialism."²²

Nonalignment as an Expression of Internationalism

The policy and practice of nonalignment, which is aimed at building up a new, more just and more humanistic international economic order, at the same time strengthens progressive forces and aspirations within individual countries and affirms the principles of an independent and peaceful foreign policy based on principle. It also tends to overcome the old forces and relations and to clear the way toward the victory of new human relations and new relations among states. It is thanks to this kind of content and orientation that the policy of nonalignment contributes most directly to achievement of the principles of internationalist cooperation among socialist and progressive forces. This is being manifested more and more in the context of the stronger and stronger affirmation of the solidarity of peoples and revolutionary movements on a world scale. Internationalism will become representative of the most progressive movements and aspirations to the extent that it is consistent and speedy in liberating itself from its own restrictiveness and is no longer cramped by the membrane of the camp-oriented interpretation it has been given in one part of the communist and worker movement.

The struggle for peace and equal relations and legitimate demands to encourage and support more harmonious economic development of the underdeveloped part of the world on the basis of unconditional credit financing and the granting of aid, makes it a necessity that the focus of international activity be shifted toward the essential events of the present time and the interests of the anticolonial and newly liberated countries and forces. Any

attempt to bypass the true content and orientation of socialist internationalism, which means long-term equal cooperation with all progressive forces in the world and support of the progressive aspirations of those forces--leads toward a new kind of negation of true internationalist cooperation.

Nonalignment, which is founded on the essence of internationalism--assurance of the full freedom, independence and equality of peoples and states--not only does not collide with internationalism, but represents an expression of its true revolutionary spirit.

An internationalism which overlooked having any such function and orientation, which neglected the burning problems of humanity, would inevitably come into conflict not only with the policy of nonalignment, but above all with its own basic functionality, with the essential meaning sketched out for it in the classics of Marxism and confirmed in the practice of revolutionary movements even under present-day conditions. Whenever it becomes confined to a definite framework and is oriented toward a particular camp, then it goes in opposition to its own nature and to the content of proletarian internationalism as conceived in Marxism-Leninism. Back in 1970 Comrade Tito issued a visionary warning in the general debate at the Third Conference of Nonaligned Countries: "When we come out in favor of a more uniform development of the world, we are not demanding this merely for the sake of aid to the underdeveloped, but also because this is an economic necessity which is in the interest of all." And then later: "We are not fighting, then, solely to have a better place for ourselves in the present world! We are fighting for a better world in general!... It is therefore indispensable to build up the kind of system for cooperation and relations which would guarantee effective mutual aid and solidarity."

We recognize in this vision how far-reaching are the reasons for strengthening nonalignment as our own enduring orientation in foreign policy, as our own contribution to internationalism and our own pledge to the world-historical and working-class transformation of the world and of relations in it.

Under present conditions the policy of nonalignment is actually the appropriate global--and at the same time optimal--framework for development of internationalist cooperation. The broad range of countries which have liberated themselves or are liberating themselves from colonial rule are achieving in the most direct way the basic aspirations of that policy, such as freedom, sovereignty, independence, nonintervention in the affairs of countries and movements, mutual cooperation on an equal footing, mutual aid and aid from outside without political conditions and pressures. In short, this is the policy of building a new and more just and more humanistic economic order and a fairer distribution of man-made goods and the results of human labor on a world scale, a policy of peace and progress and, taken in the overall, of socialism. It is for that reason that the struggle for further development and strengthening of the movement toward nonalignment also represents the greatest contribution to socialist internationalism.

On this goal Comrade Stane Dolanc said in an interview with the newspaper L'UNITA, the organ of the Communist Party of Italy: "Nonalignment, then, will continue in the future to be the foundation of Yugoslav foreign policy.... No other policy is possible for Yugoslavia ... if you like, this is our contribution to internationalism. I might put it still more precisely: the policy of nonalignment is an aspect of the class struggle in a global and historical context."

As an overall conclusion we might say that the effective struggle for socialism, for a better world, organized on the foundations of peace, equal cooperation, mutual aid, respect for the specific conditions of development and the struggle of each individual people for progress and democratic relations--is not possible without full independence, sovereignty, freedom and autonomous decisionmaking concerning the content, strategies and forms of one's own development. Only a people which is free, independent and equal can authentically fight for socialism in its own country and extend aid for that same kind of struggle outside its boundaries. This is in fact the essence of internationalism. The Yugoslav worker movement and socialist self-managed Yugoslavia, consistently implementing the principles of a peaceful, democratic and socialist foreign policy based on nonalignment, as its greatest contribution to internationalist cooperation and the solidarity of all revolutionary and progressive forces of the world, stand for that kind of relations among socialist countries and for that kind of internationalist cooperation.

FOOTNOTES

1. V. I. Lenin, "Dela" [Works], Vol XXIV, p 247.
2. There were Poles, Hungarians, Yugoslavs, Germans, and so on in high positions in the official bodies of the Commune.
3. K. Marx and F. Engels, "Izabrana dela" [Selected Works], Vol I, p 473.
4. V. I. Lenin, "Izabrana dela" [Selected Works], Vol 10, Belgrade, Kultura, 1960, p 456.
5. "Program SKJ" [LCY Program], p 70.
6. "Istorija medjunarodnog radnickog i socijalistickog pokreta" [History of the International Worker and Socialist Movement], Belgrade, 1952, p 551.
7. V. Begovic, "Tito--biografske beleske" [Tito--Biographical Notes], Belgrade, Komunist, 1972, p 80.
8. Tito, "Govori i clanci" [Speeches and Articles], Vol II, p 216.

9. The first such world conference of communist and worker parties was held in 1957, and the second in 1960. In the meantime, in 1967, a European conference of communist parties was held at Karlovy Vary, and in 1969 there was another world conference. The LCY did not attend these conferences.
10. Even today the thesis is still in effect that relations among socialist countries cannot be based on peaceful coexistence, since this is conceived merely as the type of relationship and cooperation with countries of a different social system (the capitalist countries), and that relations and cooperation among socialist countries develop on the foundations of proletarian internationalism, which is a kind of affirmation of the camp-oriented conception of proletarian internationalism. It is said that "the only exception might be" establishment of relations and cooperation on the foundations of peaceful coexistence between the USSR and the People's Republic of China.
11. "Deveti kongres SKJ" [Ninth LCY Congress], Belgrade, Kultura, 1969, pp 137-138.
12. Ibid.
13. Tito, address, "Deseti kongres SKJ" [Tenth LCY Congress], Belgrade, Komunist, 1974, pp 15-16.
14. The reader will be familiar with the position of S. Kovalev, to the effect that "... every communist party is responsible not only to its own people, but also to all the socialist countries and the entire communist movement" (PRAVDA, 26 September 1968). The Bulgarian author Kesev has written: "A socialist country does not in fact have true sovereignty, but one can only speak of the sovereignty of the socialist country" (RABOTNICESKO DELO, 22 December 1968).
15. "Deseti kongres SKJ," resolution, p 351.
16. "Document of the European Communist and Worker Parties," BORBA, 3 July 1976.
17. V. I. Lenin, "Izabrana dela," Vol 13, Belgrade, Kultura, 1960, p 500.
18. Tito, "Sedmi kongres SKJ" [Seventh LCY Congress], Belgrade, Kultura, 1958, p 35.
19. "Program Saveza komunista Jugoslavije" [Program of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia], p 70.
20. Dr A. Grlickov, BORBA, 26 June 1976.
21. For more on this see L'UNITA, 28 August 1968.
22. "Sedmi kongress SKJ," Belgrade, Kultura, 1958, p 237, LCY Program.

YUGOSLAVIA

LCY SECRETARY DOLANC ANSWERS QUESTIONS ON BELGRADE TV PROGRAM

Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 1037 GMT 3 Jun 77 LD

[Excerpts] Belgrade--Stane Dolanc, secretary of the executive committee of the LCY Central Committee Presidium, spoke in the new series of programs "Face to Face" on Belgrade Television on 23 May. The program was devoted to the preparations for the 11th LCY Congress. In addition to answering questions put to him by the program editor Dusan Mitevic, Stane Dolanc also answered a large number of questions put to him by the viewers and visitors to the exhibition on the revolutionary work of Comrade Tito at the Belgrade Fair.

The text of Stane Dolanc's replies will be published in the 6 June issue of KOMUNIST.

[Mitevic] I would like to begin the conversation with a practical question. Are you satisfied with the pace and course of the Congress preparations?

[Dolanc] It is too early to make an assessment of the Congress preparations, but I think that it is good that all corresponding commissions have started to prepare the theses for the draft Congress documents. It is known that the LCY Central Committee Presidium has set up a committee for the preparation of the 11th Congress; this committee has set up several commissions, subcommissions and working groups composed, so to speak of all structures of our society. These bodies have the task of preparing by the end of June the first proposed theses of the Congress documents to be discussed later by the Presidium and published in the fall this year. At the moment the tasks are being carried out according to plan, and we hope that all will abide by the stipulated deadlines.

However, it is very important that the preparations for the 11th Congress should embrace the entire League of Communists--the membership and the leading organs of the League of Communists--and should also be joined by those who are not members of the League of Communists but of other sociopolitical organizations, all citizens who can help with their proposals, views and stances on individual questions to successfully prepare the Congress. This is especially necessary since the Congress must make a comprehensive assessment of the position of our society at the present moment and determine how far we have got in the development of socialist self-managing relations. Of course, the Congress will more thoroughly deal with the role, place and basic tasks of the LCY at this stage of development of self-managing relations in our society, and it will also consider [words indistinct] questions. The wider, the more

comprehensive and the more all-embracing the pre-Congress debate about all this, the better will be the Congress preparations and--what is even more important-- the more successful will be the drafting of documents to be debated and adopted by the 11th LCY Congress.

We have a new constitution, the law on associated labor and a large number of documents which determine in principle and chart the direction of the development of our society. The law on associated labor is one of the basic political documents of our society. During the preparations for the Congress at the Congress itself and, also, after it, we must work above all in order to make everything that we have agreed upon and everything that we have accepted and is expressed in these documents, the direct practice of our entire society and of all its sections.

It could be said that action is necessary to implement everything that was decided on at the 10th Congress.

[Question] In preparing this problem, the television team also visited Trbovlje. There we had talks about the economic problems and the development of socio-economic and self-managing relations. On that occasion one of the miners said that we are only just getting underway with the implementation of the law on associated labor. Do you think that this statement has a broader significance?

[Answer] Undoubtedly, I think that this statement does not concern merely Trbovlje but our entire society. It is true that we are just about beginning to implement the law on associated labor although we have already achieved much success in its application.

Some people doubt whether everything stipulated by the law on associated labor will be economically justified. Less doubts have been expressed as regards the political justification of the law, but attempts were made to call the law into question by asserting that some of its premises. Above all, decentralization and the transfer of the right of the direct decision-making to working people, call into question the management of business activities.

In practice, however, precisely the opposite is happening. Since we have been implementing the law on associated labor we have achieved greater stability in economic activity. The number of work organizations which are proving more capable than before and the number of organizations which are more capable than before of making investments into expanded reproduction and into new projects is growing. "To lower" responsibility in decision-making on the conditions and resources of work and income "down" to the basic organizations of associated labor has strongly encouraged the process of the pooling of resources and capital. There has never before in our country been such a large number of mergers as now when we are implementing the law on associated labor. Major, complex organizations of associated labor are merging, and not only are they economically strong but the relations among the people in them make it possible for the working people themselves to make decisions on their own future and on the future of their work organization.

However, all these are only initial steps in the development of a new process. What has been achieved so far--that is, the existing situation--should not be idealized. There are still difficulties, lack of understanding and resistance. I am even convinced that much of the resistance stems from not understanding the problem. The fact that there are quite a number of difficulties is the result of the fact that our working people are still not aware of all the rights and responsibilities which they enjoy on the basis of the constitution and the law and that they have still not fully grasped what they can and must do today as exponents of the process of self-managing decision-making. [Passage omitted on the profitability of the Trbovlje Mine and the need for modern equipment there.]

[Question] In the movie I also saw details of the activity of the klek local community in the rural area of Trbovlje. What impresses one are the practical aspects of the work of this local community, about which one could say that it truly lives according to the constitution. Is this also the case with other local communities, in particular those in urban areas?

[Answer] With this question you have, I think, introduced yet another exceptionally significant problem. In fact, we are already listing problems which will be dealt with by the 11th LCY Congress.

With reference to local communities, it must be said that, unfortunately, at times insufficient attention is paid to life and work in these basic cells of our society. It is simply forgotten that the entire living and working process is carried out in the local community, in the work organization and in the interest community--in fact, with regard to the various problems of human relationships, this process is concentrated largely in the local community.

People live in the local community. If social relations in it are developed in the spirit of the constitution then, logically, it is from the local community that progressive and real proposals will come as regards the best possible organizational standards also in the municipality, the republic and the federation. If these proposals are accepted and implemented, the policy will be supported by the people and will be their policy in the full sense of the word.

What is very important is how the League of Communists is organized in the local community and how the League of Communists organization is able to grasp the problems of the local community and to promote their resolution. Unfortunately, some communists who are organizationally linked in League of Communists organizations in work organizations believe that there is no place for them or that there are no tasks for them in the League of Communists organization "in the field," where they live.

Thus, the League of Communists organizations in local communities chiefly comprise only those comrades who are already retired or are not employed--mainly housewives and perhaps one or two people who are not tied up elsewhere. Therefore, the basic organizations of the League of Communists in local communities often do not live and work as they should. After all, organizations composed in this way can objectively hardly deal with the increasingly responsible tasks in the increasingly complex conditions of activity in local communities.

It is interesting that the socialist alliance works better in local communities in rural areas, such as the klek local community, than in communities in urban areas.

The influence of the trade unions is virtually not felt in local communities. Some comrades think that this is natural because the tasks of the Trade Union Federation are realized only in the work organization. However, I do not think that this is so. The tasks of the trade unions are considerably broader than the obligations in the work organization. [Passage omitted on the tasks of the trade unions and the Trjovlje local community].

By involving farmers in various forms of cooperation, we have for a number of years now been changing the economic and thus also the social relations in the village. After World War II our country carried out radical changes in the village and in the social structure of the population as a whole. After the war Yugoslavia was an undeveloped agricultural country in which over 70 percent of the population made a living from agriculture and only a little over 28 percent from other activities. Today the picture is reversed. All this, it goes without saying, has had great social consequences, and it was also accompanied by the difficulties and problems of the people who left their villages to go to the urban areas. The result was that agricultural production also stagnated for some time. Only recently has it begun to develop again. Of all the achievements we realized after the armed part of the revolution, the greatest for me is most certainly the fact that differences between the village and the town have slowly but surely disappeared. This is what Lenin described as one of the greatest things that society can achieve. [Passage omitted dealing with exemplary Selevac farming community]

The LCY Central Committee Presidium has discussed on several occasions the problems of agriculture and the village. Recently, it devoted a session to these problems. However, I am afraid that the concepts concerning the stimulation of production by individual peasants through cooperation with agricultural combines and through developing cooperatives have not yet been clarified everywhere. We have to do everything possible to increase agricultural production. Let us not be afraid of the so-called capitalization [kapitalizacija] of the peasants because it is simply not possible. It can be successfully prevented by the tax system and by other social measures. However, what we do need is for us as a society to provide incentives to the farmers to work and to produce. And if they work let them earn money and, of course, let them be ready to give society what they should.

[Question] Let us now go over to the questions put by viewers. Peter Milanovic from Novi Beograd asks the following: "Comrade Dolanc announced some time ago that there will be a report by Comrade Kardelj about the problems of socialist democracy. What has happened to that?"

[Answer] The session of the LCY Central Committee Presidium at which Comrade Kardelj will submit this report has been convened for 13 June. This session will discuss the directions of the further building of the political system of socialist self-managing democracy and the tasks of the leading subjective

forces of society. Comrade Kardelj's report and the material and attitudes of this session will certainly serve as an important document in preparations for the 11th LCY Congress.

[Question] Among the questions asked there are also about 10--which, I must admit, I did not expect--which refer to political suitability in our society.

Here is a question from Mica Stojadinovic from Smederevo: "Comrade Dolanc, there are phenomena of individuals being ignored, fettered and made apathetic in carrying out social self-managing tasks through the erroneous interpretation of political suitability. We ask your opinion about it".

[Answer] I believe that there are such cases. We have spoken and written a great deal about moral-political suitability. The LCY Central Committee Presidium also defined its attitude on this in one of its documents. To put it concisely, this is a question of attitude toward socialist self-management and the policy of nonalignment. Therefore, if somebody equated moral-political suitability with membership in the League of Communists, then he, let me be quite clear, is wrong, because a person who is not a member of the League of Communists can still be morally politically suitable if he has a correct attitude toward socialist self-management, toward the working class and the working people and their role in our society, toward our country's policy of nonalignment. For me all these represent basic criteria of moral-political suitability.

It is clear that these criteria should be elaborated in order to determine what a positive attitude toward socialist self-management, and so forth, means. He who today fights for the worker to control his product and his surplus value, to me that man is moral and politically suitable. It is here, in fact, that morality begins and that it is being tested. And he who fights for the independence of our country, for its integrity, for its sovereignty, for its nonaligned position--he too, is morally and politically suitable.

The people usually ask: Is moral-political suitability synonymous with membership in the League of Communists. Certainly, a member of the League of Communists should have a positive attitude toward all the values which I have mentioned and he, therefore, is morally and politically suitable. But not only he, certainly not only he. A large majority of our people who follow the socialist self-managing course are also morally and politically suitable and they, too, can discharge all the functions in our society and be at their place of work.

[Question] Stanimir Ristic's question says: "I work in Galenika. In our work organization much importance is attached to the ideo-political education of young workers, of members of the League of Communists and of members of the Socialist Youth Federation of Yugoslavia. However, secretaries of basic youth organizations do not attend political schools. Do they, Comrade Dolanc, need education?"

[Answer] I think that you have brought up one of the most topical questions in society. The question of education. And this not only of the education of the young but also of older people, of all of us in every job and in every position.

We are developing socialist self-management. The people's rights and responsibilities in our system are great. But we must not be conceited and think that just because the working people have great rights everybody is also capable of realizing these rights. To have these rights realized the working man must have knowledge, must be educated, must know our sociopolitical and economic relations, he must know, if you like, certain categories of Marxist science, he must know self-managing relations as a whole. Without education, both basic and advanced, without continuous education of the adults we shall not succeed. Many problems in our country are due to people's insufficient knowledge. [Passage containing reference to the latest LCY Presidium session which dealt with education omitted]

Education is one of the most urgent tasks of our society now. Therefore, education and the reform of the educational system is a concern of all subjective factors in society, including the youth organization.

[Question] Franjo Strbac from Lendava, Slovenia, asks: "Would it serve any purpose if the 11th Congress were to change or amend the program of the League of Communists?"

[Answer] I think that it would be neither useful nor necessary for the program of the LCY to change in any way. [Passage describing the perfection of the LCY program omitted]

[Question] Aleksa Lekovic from Nis asks: "What will be the fundamental changes made to the statute of the LCY at the 11th Congress?"

[Answer] You see, the first discussions on the changes in the statute have only just started. Our point of departure must be the basic organizations of the League of Communists. In view of the major changes in society--the founding of basic organizations of associated labor and of complex organizations of associated labor, the formation of self-managing interest communities, the expanded role of local communities, and so forth--something will most certainly have to change in the work and organization of basic organizations of the League of Communists. Some changes in the organization of the leading organs of the League of Communists will, in all likelihood, also have to take place. [Passage saying the statutory commission of the LCY has started its work omitted]

[Question] We also have the question from Zorn Jovenovic of Novi Beograd, and there are more of such questions. He asks: "Why has the action on investigating the origins of property come to a halt? Has it, Comrade Dolanc, really come to a halt? If so, is it a question of a phenomenon of broader dimensions?"

[Answer] The action concerned with investigating the origins of property has, in fact, come to a halt in a certain way. I think the reason for this is that the commissions for the investigation of the origins of property have not been sufficiently qualified or placed in the right spot in order to achieve major results. True, some results have been achieved but they are less than expected.

The Executive Committee of the Presidium of the LCY Central Committee assessed the work of these commissions a few months ago.

Our tax inspections do not work sufficiently well. They are not well enough organized and they do not have qualified cadres and, therefore, in this delicate sphere certain excesses take place, and certain people become rich, even though their own work, because they do not allocate to society that part of their incomes which belongs to society. It is, therefore, not surprising that in some municipalities--I am speaking in principle, for the sake of illustration--the funds of work organizations have, let us say, 100 billion old dinars, while saving deposits of individuals amount to 600 billion dinars--that is, six times more.

I certainly do not think that this money has been dishonestly acquired in the majority of cases. Nevertheless, the fact is that not enough is given to society, that the personal standard of living is developing much more quickly than the social one--that is, that the social standard could and should develop much more dynamically. Differences between individual categories of the population would disappear more quickly were everybody to fulfill his obligations toward this society. After all, the introduction of such a service in our country would not be a novelty at all. Many states today have very developed tax services and tax violations in these countries are often punished more severely than theft.

[Question] The question by Marko Dabovic from Belgrade says: "Why is the cadre rotation still carried out in a circle and not vertically and horizontally? In this way the cadres in municipalities are very often in the same job for over 20 years."

[Answer] This is no good. One should insist on the rotation being carried out truly in line with the norms which are also in force in the League of Communists and in society. But, for the situation which exists in individual environments, do not blame only those who are in the same job for 20 years. You should also blame yourself a little. In the Socialist Alliance, in the League of Communists and in the Trade Union Federation everybody can launch the initiative to have this question democratically and openly debated and everybody can ask that a man who has been too long in one place should be put somewhere else, but not in the way, as you say, "that he moves horizontally" but that he be given a function which is in line with his abilities and values.

[Question] Comrade Dolanc, recently there was a meeting of journalists from European countries in Belgrade. The meeting was described as a preparation for the meeting on European security and cooperation. These journalists took part in one of our transmissions and most of them said that they were surprised, when coming across our society, about its stability and openness. We have filmed a small event on the border crossing with Italy in Skofije. I would ask you to look at this film and to comment on it.

[Answer] Let me say right away: You started to speak of the country's stability and you showed this film about the border crossings. Were this alone to be the proof of Yugoslavia's stability I would not be very enthusiastic. Undoubtedly, this is very significant and if proof of the freedoms in our country but this is not all, this is not the main thing.

I think that there is not a single country in Europe which is more complex in its national, social and economic structure and which has made such a dynamic leap in 30 years of its transformation as our country. The stability, which is reflected in the continuous development of our social relations and not in their stagnation but precisely in their development, stems from the fact that our people, the great majority of them, have understood that socialist self-management, equality of our nations and nationalities and the policy of non-alinment represent the only alternative of our society's development.

Border crossings are secondary matters. I think that we can also prove stability by this but above all by successes which we have achieved in the development of our country.

[passage omitted: Yugoslavs traveling abroad in great numbers is a normal thing but Yugoslavia is the only country which has begun truly to fight for freedom of man for the position of the worker in production relations]

Comrade Bakaric once said that we, in our practice, of it, are exceeding the term of classical democracy. And we truly are exceeding it. We are in a stage in which we can speak of the freedom of men, of the truly free man.

If anybody thinks that he can prove the high degree of democracy by the number of border crossings or by the free behavior in Hyde Park, or by the fact that a man can walk along the street carrying a placard in his hand and shouting, it must be said that these are external, very often demagogic, forms by which so-called freedom is being proved. The criterion of freedom is the position of the worker in production relations. It is for this freedom that we fight. And it is with this fight that we are eliminating all the obstacles on the path leading to real decision-making by workers on all social affairs.

Undoubtedly, the situation on our borders is proof of the strength of our society and of the freedom in it. In this connection it is interesting to recall--and this you know--the attempt to create an affair from the fact that 60 of our citizens submitted to the constitutional court of Yugoslavia some kind of petition about there being no freedom in our country with regard to obtaining a passport. First of all, not one of those 60 citizens who signed the petition is without a passport. Second, they attacked a legislative provision which says that a passport can be denied for reasons of the country's security, although such a clause is contained in the legislations of every country in the world.

The constitutional court has made an analysis of this problem and established that there is a very small number of people in Yugoslavia (this number, I think, has also been published) who cannot obtain a passport.

[Passage omitted: Mitevic had informed Dolanc that a considerable number of viewers had asked the following question]

[Question] This is a question on a major subject which will also have to be discussed before the Congress. Do people in our country complain a lot or not? The film also gave figures about it.

[Answer] I would like to say something about this problem. The Presidium of the LCY Central Committee receives 30 to 40 complaints a day on average. The majority of these complaints, as opposed to earlier years, are signed with the full name, which also means something. All the complaints we receive in the League of Communists are being verified in various ways. Often we send them to the municipality or the committee of the environment in which the conflict arose or where the cause of the complaint lies, while some of the complaints are directly dealt with by our commission.

As much as I can ascertain from following this problem, I think that most of the complaints deal with housing-complaints about injustice in allocating apartments, petitions for apartments and so forth. We pass these complaints on to the relevant organs. Next are the requests for jobs, for a working place, complaints about injustice in employment, applications for employment and so forth.

One of the questions says that working people complain while affairs are being hushed up in our country. I can say with full responsibility that not a single affair in the League of Communists and in our society has been hushed up. One should remember what took place in the past few years. We launched an open struggle against all excesses. In the future, too, we will fight against any abuse of position, against divisions and against everything which violates our new self-managing spirit.

There will certainly be difficulties, problems and resistance to our development. But I would not agree with the view that lack of respect for human rights prevails now. I think that such cases are exceptions and that there are fewer and fewer such cases but that more is heard of them, precisely because people have more and more trust in our organs and because they are demanding their rights more and more openly. I am deeply convinced that the problems dealt with today in complaints will become fewer and fewer as our society becomes richer and as all of us work better and more, and as society will have at its disposal new apartments. [Passage omitted: Everybody must fight against injustice, inhuman and undemocratic attitudes toward people]

[Question] Comrade Dolanc, there is a group of questions which refers to the international workers' movement. I would like to mention the question put by Milan Ramadanski from Novi Sad, who asks: "Eurocommunism has emerged in Western Europe as an organized force in the international workers' movement. Up until a few years ago the CPSU exerted a dominant influence on all communist parties in Western Europe. Can we now and in the future witness a stronger influence by Eurocommunism on communist parties in the countries of people's democracies and, in general, will the Berlin Conference also reflect in this way on our debates on the international workers' movement at the 11th Congress?

[Answer] Above all, let us clarify what is "Eurocommunism." I can only accept "Eurocommunism" as a term which means something, and we are convinced that it means something, and I therefore, think that the content of this term is the positive phenomenon in today's international workers' movement. For the content of "Eurocommunism"--I do not speak of the term, and I even think the term is inadequate--in essence emerged in the struggle to overcome obsolete relations in the international workers' movement, in the struggle for independence, integrity and one's own way in the building of new and better socialist social relations in individual countries. That it emerged in the struggle against a single center, in the struggle for democracy and equality in relations among communist parties. This is the essence and, roughly, the content of "Eurocommunism."

I think that this is not a question of some kind of organized forms of Eurocommunism, although some would like, as the comrades from Novi Sad asks, to give this term the form of some kind of institution--that the three or four parties which stand on the positions of Eurocommunism represent some kind of new rallying point which opposes somebody else. No, far from it. The elements of this new phenomenon are the struggle to find and the right to find one's own path in the building of socialism, in the struggle for a better life of the working class, for independence, equality under their own conditions, in view of their internal political constellation, and so forth.

The Berlin Conference is undoubtedly a positive event in the international workers' movement, which confirmed in essence precisely these principles. Were I to compare the elements in the contents of "Eurocommunism" with the conclusions of the Berlin Conference, I would say that they are practically identical with them.

But why is all this coming to the fore now? First of all, because I think that communist parties are increasingly acquiring knowledge that the success in the struggle and in the leadership of their working class is possible only if they rely on their own forces and if they seek their own path in the building of a better future in line with the conditions, possibilities and needs of the state, of the country and of the working class in which these communist parties operate. I think that this is a trend which cannot be halted. It can still meet with difficulties, and it is encountering difficulties. There are still attempts to turn back the wheel of history and attempts--we have been able to read about them in the papers of some countries--to rehabilitate some principles of the pre-Berlin period, or even assertions that the Berlin Conference is a kind of compromise, that it represents only one experience but that there is only one single tested path which leads ahead and no other.

Owing to this general trend under these general conditions, the only progressive path is the path of relying on one's own forces and on one's own conditions. Therefore, you see, this term "Eurocommunism" has come to the fore, so to say, on the scene of the international workers' movement.

It is certain that at the 11th LCY Congress we will also have to say something about this, how we look upon these matters clearly, in the context of our struggle, of our path for the construction of socialism. I think that we have to say what we think about these matters--and we will say it!

[Question] Comrade Dolanc, the formal session of the LCY Central Committee in connection with Comrade Tito's Jubilees begins tomorrow. This is an historic moment. You have said about Comrade Tito's Jubilees, which has become a spontaneous people's holiday, that it has an encouraging significance for us. What did you have in mind in this connection?

[Answer] What is encouraging me is that in our society we are increasingly grasping the fact--and I think that this has become the constituent element in the consciousness of our people--that the struggle for socialist self-management and for Yugoslavia's independent and nonaligned position is linked directly with Comrade Tito's name and work.

[Question] I ask you, Comrade Dolanc, to say something at the end about one of your meetings with Comrade Tito which you particularly remember, as well as which of the qualities you consider particularly characteristic of Comrade Tito.

[Answer] This year will be 5 years since the letter sent to Comrade Tito, the LCY President and the Executive Bureau was released. Comrade Tito had asked us to draft this letter and a group of comrades had worked on it. We wrote the draft three times. Twice I took it to Brioni for Comrade Tito to look at. He would read the draft and return it to us. His comment was: You have not judged correctly what should be written at this moment. When I came to Brioni with the draft for the third time everything was ready for the latter to be released. Comrade Tito said: All right, I'll sign it, but had I written the letter I would have written it even more clearly.

CSO: 2800

RECENT INSTANCES OF ALLEGED SERB CHAUVINISM SCRUTINIZED

Belgrade NEDELJNE INFORMATIVNE NOVINE in Serbo-Croatian 8 May 77 pp 25-28

[Article* based on interviews of Aleksandar Vuco and other figures in Serbian cultural life: "The Act of Sitting With Arms Folded"]

[Text] Chauvinism does exist--there is no chauvinism. These two judgments recently stood in irreconcilable opposition to one another in Serbia, especially in Belgrade. People accustomed to reading between the lines puzzle out the commentary describing chauvinism in principle and in general, and they supposedly understand who is referred to, who is meant.

We are still faced with more questions than answers.

When it comes to writers, how are we to separate the writer's personality from his literary work? Where does the private personality end and the work of art begin?

Boccaccio, an impassioned speaker will say, was a necrophile. Steinbeck sent his son to Vietnam, and Jorge Luis Borges recently heaped praise on fascism and paid homage to Pinochet. Everyone knows that the mailmen buried Knut Hamsun's house with his own books: readers had returned them when he came out in favor of fascism.

It sometimes happens that the private political activity of creative artists will entirely contradict their work.

Our own writers also have dark pages in their biographies: Ducic, Svetislav Stefanovic, Dragisa Vasic, Janko Tufegdzc.... The last was propaganda chief of the Chetnik executioners. The next to last was the chief ideological adviser of Draza Mihailovic's National Committee.

* The interviews on manifestations of nationalism in culture and the writing of history were conducted by Vladimir Stojcin, Milo Gligorijevic, Dragan Markovic, Stevan Niksic and Dusan V. Stankovic, who also prepared the text.

That is unfortunately the way we are; almost all our conversations about personal and creative responsibility take on tones of anxiety. Only a few will see the tragedy in the lives of these men. But many, recalling the ugly things they said and thought, will attempt to take away what was valuable in their creative work as well.

Various Lapses of Memory

What will be our reaction to the meanderings of the living if we are unprepared, inept and mostly ineffective in assessing dead writers? Foreigners, Borges and others, we will somehow understand and explain, but what will we do with our own?

We hear, for instance, about Sava Nemanjic: everyone claims him as their own, the monarchist, the church, the Chetnik emigre community, and the inveterate chauvinistic nationalist, they read all kinds of symbols into his works, they play fast and loose with it, and they have turned him into a national saint.

In so doing, it is true, the nationalists use the shortcomings and lapses in our Marxist historiography, which has not fully accounted for this important figure. When the material is published from the recent symposium on Sava Nemanjic which was held in the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, then a judgment can be made as to whether we have made progress in explaining his personality. Those who know everything in advance, before doing any reading or thinking, waited for the symposium with their swords at the ready merely on the basis of the topic. Those who are not ready to encourage science in its creative and critical reexamination of the past are also inciters of nationalism, let there be no doubt about that.

Isn't it true that all those who in Serbia are pushing the Cyrillic alphabet, forcing it on TV Belgrade, for example, are arousing unnecessary anger? Aren't they providing the nationalists with a pretext to compose a lamentation about a supposed erasure of Serbian symbols? There is a real need for Cyrillic titles to be used in the broadcasting of TV Belgrade. Those who watch its channels have that right under the constitution. This does not mean that the Latin alphabet should be given a subordinate place in Serbia: the two scripts are equal, but it is a matter of principle in our attitude and behavior. Inconsistencies will engender new inconsistencies, and then time after time we will come round again to the same quandaries and the same arguments: nationalism exists--there is no nationalism.

How will we react when antihistorical texts romantically proclaim the Serbian army in World War I to be some kind of holy armada? Were those battles great battles, it is true that that part of our history is something for us to be proud of, but what is the point of all those romantic and mythical overtones and tearful tales about "wise leaders"? What is the consequence of intentionally forgetting the political hegemony which was the goal of official Serbia at that time? What name should we use to describe someone who today talks only about the "liberative mission" of the Serbian

army, about its "role as a savior"? It appears that we are of two kinds: those who like to liberate and those who would like to avoid unsought liberations. Are we able to say that calmly and with a clear head?

From the Coffeehouse to the Novel

A portion of this public was mainly silent when that entire tragedy in April 1941 was blamed on others, entire peoples, and when the talk about the treasonous actions of the court, the general staff and the other pillars of the monarchy which were under the Serbian thumb was merely in passing, as if these were all the consequences. From time to time the Chetnik phenomenon and the Chetnik consequences are written about as if they were "causal" phenomena and actions, "historical causes" and justifications are found. The word "revenge" is uttered.

Anyone familiar with this mentality will say that all of this is neither naive, nor spontaneous, nor incidental. It started at tables in coffee-houses and then found its way into novels and poems and "scientific" works, this disposition which wormed its way even into some members of the party and even some fighters for the communist cause who go back before the war. Nationalism--now you see it, now you don't. It is there in the newspapers, in associations, in publishing houses, in the editorial offices of magazines, in panels of judges making awards, in funds which make appropriations for cultural purposes.

The problem that is with us everywhere today is that we do not have a cultural atmosphere that makes for frank, clear and critical exchange. We are unable to carry on a true conversation about that "famous sentence" of Dragan M. Jeremic, about those "400 km" mentioned in the Zagreb newspaper OKO [EYE], which would be a conversation in which we would prove whether this was a trumped-up idea or something altogether different. We are unable to analyze this term which divided us with calm and clarity. Jeremic's sentence, which was uttered and allowed to stand, the one containing those "400 km," became a kind of belvedere for the nationalists. People moved by an imagined sense of being threatened are now holding up this sentence like a slogan.

Tanasije Mladenovic's "Triptych" recently appeared in KNIZEVNE NOVINE. The poet calls upon Serbia to rouse up, asks it "where are you headed?" and "where will your paths take you?" Now once again, a month after the poem's publication, we are divided: it is nationalistic, it is not nationalistic. Some say that it is a poem consisting of apostolic mysticism, that it might have been published in some other well-known and sorrowful time. Others say that this poet, a member of the Partisans from 1941 and a Partisan commissar, a member of parliament after the revolution, and for a time a member of the Central Committee of the League of Communists of Serbia cannot be a nationalist. How could that be, they ask, when high school and graduate papers are being written about his revolutionary poetry? Then there are those who say "it could be."

We sit with our arms folded in some coffeehouse, we carry on an endless verbal battle, and there is no clear outcome; nationalism does exist, there isn't any nationalism. In public, of course, we are silent. As if in some quarters the spirit of liberalism was still hanging on, that liberalism which gave rise to a climate of "reconciliation," compromise, and even fear of saying openly and publicly what there is to say about nationalistic manifestations and pressures. The corrosion which this attitude of *modus vivendi* and opportunism have left in our consciousness and behavior is obviously deep, deeper than was thought. It is also well known that an atmosphere is being artificially created so that the public branding of oppositionist actions would weaken and soften the antidogmatic campaign and the campaign to strengthen democratic social relations!

So, we are silent, persuaded that our silence is worthwhile.

A Calculated Deception

Our silence is actually a barrier against frankness, against the battle of opinions, it is temperizing. Those who are well informed say that nationalism is manifested in various fields of social creativity: in economics, in the handling of personnel, in science, in athletics, in culture and in art.

Never has the party wanted to have its own "party writers," "sycophants," its lackeys and errand boys. There have been some who have identified themselves with the party, and in their yearning for power and pleasure, they confuse art and ideology, they drafted all kinds of demands and sent them to artists, but this still was not the party. That was not the League of Communists of Yugoslavia. The Yugoslav revolution would never have become what it is to the world if it had been enamored of itself.

With the express intention of commencing a frank and well-argued conversation about Serb chauvinism, we called upon a handful of artists and public figures.

"Although it is difficult to cover this complicated set of problems in a few words, nationalism in literature is today an anachronism, a digression indicating lack of restraint, a lapse, and an alienation of the literary art from its true nature and mission."

These are the words of Dr Milos I. Bandic.

Nationalism is usually a deliberate deception at the service of certain other purposes and structures (outside literature, pseudoideological, reactionary). It means narrowness in outlook, narrowness of feelings, poor memory, an opposition to equality, frustration and "internal" unfreedom, a brake upon and resistance to the new cultural consciousness and self-consciousness, to the socialist outlook.

Those were also the words of Dr Bandic. He then went on:

"When it is identified, nationalism in literature turns out invariably to be in the spirit of the rumormonger, the petty rationalist, the haughty and complacent 'patriot,' pretentious and commonplace, and its proponents are commonplace and uncreative, so that nationalism has never been able and never can represent an essential threat to Serbian literature in its vital and basic freedom-loving and progressive humanistic art and thrust, its internationalist commitment and its generous spirit."

Bandic, then, does not deny that Serbian nationalism exists even today. He does not say which artist he is thinking about when he makes this diagnosis. But he said something else which is also worth hearing:

"The life work, attitude and activity--in that progressive sense--of Marko Ristic, Milan Bogdanovic, Oskar Davico, Miodrag Popovic, Dusan Matic, Radomir Konstantinovic, Dr Vasa Milincevic and so many others point to the directions and positions we can be proud of."

Silence in Fashion

Aleksandar Vuco does not see a great deal of nationalism in the press, on the radio or on the TV screen. To support his assertion he cites the great number of articles and programs sent in from other republics and regions and broadcast or published here. But, he says:

"Matters stand differently when it comes to books. I do not like it that we are such an ingrown community, at least in the publishing world. If, say, I want to buy a Slovenian book, I have to go to Ljubljana. In Ljubljana there are no books published in Belgrade or Zagreb. The example of these two cities also applies to all the republic capitals. This, of course, is not part of nationalism, but being ingrown is one of the features of nationalism. Every national community should respect the past of another national community, provided it does not transform that past into a myth. Myths are harmful."

Indeed they are, and Vuco, when he says that myths are harmful, knows which myths have done us the greatest harm.

Vuco undoubtedly knows a great deal about both old and new myths. He also knows quite a bit about our customary and supposedly wise silence, which is almost unbroken from day to day.

It unfortunately seems as if silence is in fashion. Silence is kept in the newspapers, on television, in the magazines, and silence is sometimes kept at the speaker's platform of political forums. For example, there has been silence about the film which was shown on one of the English television channels that included an appearance of Dobrica Cosic, a novelist with a large following who is a well-known name in Serbian literature. It presented a dark picture of Yugoslavia, a kind of "Balkaniad." Why hasn't this been shown in Yugoslavia as well? Do we suppose that our people are so politically illiterate that they are unable to know what is what, that

they have to be spoonfed their information? Perhaps a great deal more could have been achieved by showing this film than by passing it over in silence. It is certain that our people would have been horrified. Perhaps even Dobrica Cosic would have been horrified.

Nihilism and the Rest

We also called upon Dragan M. Jeremic, president of the Association of Serbian Writers who has been attacked and defended, a professor at the Faculty of Philosophy in Belgrade, and editor in chief of KNIZEVNE NOVINE, to say something about all this, about Serbian nationalism. Jeremic does not think that Tanasije Mladenovic's poem published in KNIZEVNE NOVINE is the kind of material that calls for sounding an alarm.

But he does not say that there is no chauvinism:

"From a dialectical perspective one can note that nationalism goes hand in hand with something that is its utter opposite: national nihilism. National nihilism is an attitude which is manifested in the attempt to belittle and discredit everything that a people has achieved so far in various domains, from the military field to culture. National nihilism weakens the people's sense of itself, diminishes its self-confidence, encourages defeatism, and ultimately leads it to subjugation by other peoples. But since exaggeration in one direction always evokes exaggeration on the other side as a counterbalance, there is resistance to national nihilism, and a climate favorable to chauvinism is created. National nihilism, then, is also one of the sources of chauvinism."

Jeremic says that criticism of chauvinism frequently goes so far as to deny those things which have unquestionable national value.

"The pinning on of blanket or individual labels is not effective enough in the campaign against chauvinism because they do not go to its essence and do not indicate the various aspects of its manifestation, but are satisfied with superficial observations concerning isolated and typical cases of it. This leads to condemnation of certain nationalistic outbreaks, and certain individuals are branded, but chauvinism itself remains alive in the shadow of real and ideological circumstances which have not been overcome. If we want to shove chauvinism into the antique shop of history, we must devote much more attention to it, by which I mean strict, scientific and critical analysis."

Dangerous Extravagance

We have unfortunately been talking for decades about the lack of criticism and debate, and then something happens which needs to be given a clear and precise name: but how can this be done in a normal way without a challenge, without first creating an atmosphere for debate and criticism?

A painter who is in love with the myths of the past need not be a chauvinist, but his statements, his remarks, his publicly stated fears concerning the national heritage will incite the chauvinism of others.

Was Milic Stankovic of Macva, whose creative successes are beyond doubt, a chauvinist at the moment when he wrote back to the Valjevo Museum that he was returning them a letter addressed to him in the Latin alphabet and written in the Latin alphabet, since he accepts such letters only from Slovenia and Croatia?!

Recently PRAVOSLAVLJE published a statement by Milic in which he praised PRAVOSLAVLJE as a frank and polemical newspaper:

"In a sea of mediocrity, in a world that has become technological and has been maliciously subjected to a gray uniformity, that newspaper treats all the most significant events which are so vitally important to the spiritual development of the Serb people, the name Serb and the preservation of that name, and it boldly enters into debates. We remember the recent debate between Bishop Vasilije of Zica about defense of holy relics."

Statements like that can set some people off on a troublesome road.

NIN's reporter spoke in Novi Sad with Jovan Soldatovic, also an artist and a man who is not intimidated at all by the "name Serb."

"The scenes which I state as a sculptor and the efforts to humanize existence in which I am a participant have separated me from what is local and national and taken me toward what belongs to all humanity. There are no reasons for separation on the basis of race, much less nationality. What interests me is man!"

Isolationism Without a Future

A peaceable man will say that it takes all kinds to make a world. Peaceableness in this case, the man who knows the power of public statements will say, shows a lack of interest in the spiritual health of the people.

Vidosav Stevanovic, one of the young generation of excellent prose writers, says that a distinction must be made between what is national and what is nationalistic. He says that we should distinguish these two concepts, demonstrate their spheres and their influences, and clearly define their social and political role, pointing out the differences and contrasts.

"In literature," Stevanovic says, "and probably in other fields of culture as well--there are substitutions and wrong names put to things, vague charges and muddled defense. I will simplify things a bit in order to make it easier to understand, and I will state them in their rough and elementary form. It is one thing to make an uncritical borrowing of foreign, say, progressive examples and ready-made models of writing--which made their appearance in other periods and under other conditions--and something else to make

a modern, critical and selective use of a national tradition, to make a contemporary interpretation of the national identity, to adopt in a sensible and creative way the results of other cultures, and then it is quite a third thing to be passive and ingrown, to enjoy in a primitive way one's own domestic folklore and engage in a mere reproduction of old-style and ossified exemplars and models. The first of these conceptions is the consequence of losing one's own identity and creativity. The second is an expression of a sound understanding of the complicated nature of literature: in its esthetics, its function as a creator of symbols, its sociology, its politics, its perspicacity and its creativity. The third is an indicator of inferiority, an indicator of real or fictitious threat, and isolationism without a future. There is no question of the choice that will be made by a true artist, a conscientious writer, one who is aware of his time and of his society."

We asked Stevanovic whether this isolationism, this primitive enjoyment of the parochial, of local color exists with us? Is there any mere reproduction of old-style and ossified exemplars and models?

Stevanovic thinks that there are such cases, that they are not even few in number, nor are they quantitatively insignificant, but that their artistic insignificance and simplicity reduce them to mere by-products, to simple reproductions, which means that they are discredited.

The Two Extremes

Have we succeeded in initiating a true conversation about Serbian nationalism? Will we succeed in answering the questions we have been posing for years? Will we be able to say whether there is more nationalism in culture than in athletics, say, than in the economy, in politics...?

Do we know how to explain our own silence?

Why are so few people participating in these conversations?

How is it that some peoples, the French say, deflate the national myth in their literature (we recall Jarry's "Ubu Roi") while we show reticence, a readiness for roundabout conversations, those conversations in which the wolves are fed and yet all the sheep are with the flock. And we show some other things as well, but true frankness is a rare thing.

Incidentally, how important is it today to talk about national feeling, about national identity, about outbreaks of chauvinism?

Dr Vladimir Jovicic once said that national feelings and national identity are deeply affected by history, but they cannot have the same value at every moment of history.

"Just imagine," Jovicic says, "a man who is 150 years old and who has preserved in himself the euphoric national and even chauvinistic feelings of

the youth movement of the 1860's. What sort of anachronism would that be today in a context of national freedom! But then imagine the other extreme as well: what would be our critical assessment of the youth movement of the 1860's outside of the historical context which engendered it, detached from the fact that Serbia in that time was fighting for national freedom. So, a thing might be anachronistic in the seventh decade of this century or even reactionary, while in the same decade of the last century, when we make the strictest judgment, it was basically revolutionary, authentically patriotic and liberative.... That shows the extent to which national feeling is historical."

The Spirit of the Revolution

Will reduction of the Battle of Kosovo to some dozen romantic lines in readers and textbooks, to take an example, favor the development of national feeling or chauvinism?

We did not put this question to anyone, but it should be put.

The posing of such question signifies an opposition to silence, an opposition to the act of sitting with folded arms.

The Yugoslav revolution has demonstrated and tested its consciousness of the class question and the nationality question under equally dramatic conditions in all the difficult stages of our development. This also applies fully, as an established truth of history, to the Serbian people as well. That people has accepted the policy of the Communist Party, without an alternative, as the only possible policy both for its own national future and for life in the community. Had it not done so, would a few thousand communists (isolated and without a program which might represent the consciousness of the entire people) have succeeded with the uprising, or would this have been a desperate Jacobin escapade?

Had it not, would the organized rebellion have begun on such a large scale here in Serbia and as early as the 7th of July? Would hundreds of thousands of Serbs have waged war and died on the side of the revolution in spite of the Chetnik manhunt and the scimitars held at their throats?

In seeking a Marxist assessment of the past, of tradition, of the heritage, the LCY has always said that history does not begin with it, does not begin today, that we must preserve and develop in new forms everything that is valuable to the people's past. The communists have always known that they themselves would lose their roots and points of support if they abolished the national dimension. They have also reacted strongly on occasions when one system of thought, one manner of reaction, one mode of feeling for historical and cultural values was proclaimed the most important, crucial and decisive. Or when partialization was adopted instead of diversity, resulting in the belittling of some nearby world that is related to us, and of everything that lies in the depths of its history and in its national identity.

"In a possible conflict between these two tendencies, it is best to hold to the method of the naturalist, the gardener, the physician, who do not prevent processes, but guard them and reduce them to their natural dimensions."

These are the words of Bosko Petrovic, a writer and secretary of Matica Srpska.

"This entire problem area," Dr Milos I. Bandic concludes, "cannot be resolved with statements, in a declarative manner, but only by systematic and objective debates, with criticism, with Marxist and scientific research and analysis. And also by a further revolutionization of relations between the field of culture and the field of work. The spirit of the revolution must again be found, as Marx puts it, so that new points of departure are created for cultural development. These points of departure are vitally important because of the present and future generations of young people, of cultural and literary creators, so that they are free and unburdened with the negative legacy of the past."

So, nationalism does exist. Is it coming out of the antique shop or going into the antique shop?

7045
CS0: 2800

END